DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 221 106 HE 015 438

TITLE	Visions and Decisions. Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (21st, Colorado Springs, Colorado, November 8-11, 1981).
INSTITUTION	American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-88044-061-9
PUB DATE	82
NOTE	105p.
AVAILABLE FROM	American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Suite 700, One Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036.
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrators; Awards; *College Administration; College Presidents; *Decision Making; Foreign Countries; *Government School Relationship; Higher Education; International Relations; *Leadership Qualities; *Professional Associations; State Colleges; State Universities
IDENTIFIERS	Brazil

ABSTRACT

The theme of the 21st annual meeting of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) was consideration of the missions of member institutions and the leadership required to execute them. Through institutional visions, the creative process of education takes place, and the hard decisions of higher education leaders help ensure that the visions are fulfilled. Papers include: "Visions and Revisions" (keynote, Leon Stein); "The Administration Program for Higher Education" (Terrell Bell); "Visions...Decisions...and Real Leadership" (Reatha Clark King); "Partners Still!" (spouses' session, Marguerite Walker Corbally); "The Decision to Lead" (Mary Jean Pew); "An Overview of Brazil's Development and of U.S./Brazilian Relations" (Antonio F. Azeredo da Silveira); "Federal Relations in a Changed Environment" (E. K. Fretwell, Jr.); Presentation Address for the G. Theodore Mitau Award (Glenn S. Dumke); reports of the AASCU president and treasurer; report on the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation; and report on the Office for the Advancement of Public Negro Colleges. Also included are the associations' resolutions and officers' election notes, and a tribute to, presentation to, and acceptance remarks by Merze Tate, recipient of the Distinguished Alumnus Award. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED221106

VISIONS AND DECISIONS

1981 Proceedings

HE 015 438

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AASCU

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

2

aascu

21st Annual Meeting November 8-11, 1981 Colorado Springs, Colorado

PROCEEDINGS

of the

21st Annual Meeting

American Association of State Colleges and Universities

November 8-11, 1981
Colorado Springs, Colorado

American Association of State Colleges and Universities
Suite 700
One Dupont Circle
Washington, DC 20036
202/293-7070

Allan W. Ostar
President

© 1982 by American Association of State Colleges and Universities
One Dupont Circle/Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publications Data

American Association of State Colleges and Universities.
Meeting (21st : 1981 : Colorado Springs, Colorado)
Visions and decisions

1. State universities and colleges—United States—Congresses. 2. American Association of State Colleges and Universities. Meeting (21st : 1981 : Colorado Springs, CO)
I. Title.
LB2329.5.A44 1982 378'.053 82-11504
ISBN: 0-88044-061-9

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

GENERAL SESSION ADDRESSES

Keynote Address

Visions and Revisions 3
Leon Stein
Author

Administrative Address

The Administration Program for Higher Education 9
The Honorable Terrel Bell
Secretary of Education

President-to-Presidents Lecture

Visions . . . Decisions . . . and Real Leadership 13
Reatha Clark King, President
Metropolitan State University, Minnesota

Spouses' Session Address

Partners Still! 27
Marguerite Walker Corbally
Author

Leadership Address

The Decision to Lead 33
Mary Jean Pew
Member of the California Board of Trustees

International Address

An Overview of Brazil's Development and of U.S./
Brazilian Relations 37
H. E. Antonio F. Azeredo da Silveira
Ambassador of Brazil to the United States

Federal Relations Address

Federal Relations in a Changed Environment 41
E. K. Fretwell Jr., Chancellor
The University of North Carolina at Charlotte

G. Theodore Mitau Award Address

Presentation Address 51
Glenn S. Dumke, President
California State University

CONCURRENT SESSION ADDRESSES 55

PLENARY SESSION

Report of the Chairman 63
Roland Dille, President
Moorhead State University, Minnesota

Report of the President 67
Allan W. Ostar

Report of the Treasurer 71
Rodney A. Briggs, President
Eastern Oregon State College

Report on the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation 73
Robert Ewigleben, President
Ferris State College, Michigan

Report on the Office for the Advancement of Public Negro Colleges 77
Leonard Haynes, Director
Office for the Advancement of Public Negro Colleges

Resolutions 81

Election of Officers and Directors. 100

DISTINGUISHED ALUMNUS AWARD

Tribute to Dr. Merze Tate 101
John Bernhard, President
Western Michigan University

Presentation 103
Roland Dille, President
Moorhead State University, Minnesota

Acceptance Remarks 104
Merze Tate
Educator and Author

INTRODUCTION

The 21st Annual Meeting of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities was held November 8-11, 1981, at the Broadmoor Hotel in Colorado Springs, Colorado. Over 500 presidents, chancellors, and guests attended. Using the theme "Visions . . . and Decisions," the AASCU members were able to consider the missions of their institutions and the leadership required to execute the missions. Through the "vision" of the institutions, the creative process of education takes place; the hard "decisions" on the part of higher education leaders ensure the vision is fulfilled.

Attendees were presented with a panorama of the difficult decisions they will have to make in the decade ahead, particularly in light of the changing role of the federal government in higher education.

In spite of the uncertainty, visions abounded. The President-to-Presidents lecturer, Reatha Clark King, president of Metropolitan State University (MN), spoke of "higher purposes" which must be "rooted in our visions, and our desires and steadfast efforts as presidents to secure educational opportunity, freedom, justice, and human rights for individuals and for domestic world peace."

VISIONS . . . AND REVISIONS

Leon Stein
Editor Emeritus, Justice, and
Member, National Council for the Humanities

I accepted Dr. Dille's invitation because he and I, as you will see, are in the visions business. We deal with visions and sometimes we are able to turn them into realities.

There are all kinds of visions—individual visions and collective visions, visions of beauty, visions of power, inspiring visions. But if there is a single, overarching vision that has haunted our nation since its beginning it is of a time when, through educational enterprise, we shall have established and preserved freedom, justice, and equality for all who live in this land.

How is this to be accomplished when equality implies difference, justice is coupled with punishment, and freedom requires restraint? Madison, in Federalist paper 10, asks how can a nation with more factions than there are shingles on a roof survive? It must either tolerate them or suppress them. We have a right, nay a duty, to examine whether we have developed an educational system best designed to achieve our national purpose.

In the days when higher education was reserved chiefly for leadership factions of the nation, George Washington visited New England. At that time, John Quincy Adams, at the age of twenty, was studying law with Judge Parsons of Newburyport. The worthy jurist was selected to make a welcoming address. He directed each of his students to draft a text. Of course, the one he chose to deliver was the one written by young Adams. By that time the son of the second president of the United States had been to school in Paris and Amsterdam, had studied at the University of Leyden, had served at age 14 as private secretary to our minister in St. Petersburg and had graduated from Harvard.

Is it any wonder, then, that years later this paragon of culture and public service slipped his gentility when it was announced that his alma mater planned to bestow an honorary degree on President Jackson? Adams fumed that he would not be present "to witness (Harvard's) disgrace in conferring her highest literary honors upon a barbarian."

Jackson had deprived Adams of a second term as president. He had fought duels and Indians. He had scandalized Washington with his problems with women. When he won the presidency, the White House was invaded by hordes of his followers, roughnecks who trampled the fine carpets with their muddy boots. His education had been minimal and in the eyes of a cultured New Englander, Jackson and his cohorts were indeed barbarians.

Jefferson was more tolerant. Nurtured on the writings of the French philosophies, he early laid out a rational plan for the general diffusion of knowledge in Virginia. A system of free public schools would be available to all children—rich and poor alike—

beginning with a three-year common grade school. With no regard for origin, the system would "rake from the rubbish" those geniuses destined to move up to college and university and the higher education that would fit them for positions of leadership in business, the professions, and government. Virginia vetoed the plan.

Now, here were two national leaders dedicated to building a free nation of that new breed called Americans by Crevecoeur. And one talks of rubbish and the other of barbarians. Cities were developing and the nation was beginning the shift from agrarianism to industrialism; new industrial disciplines would require from the armies of labor mechanical skills, cooperative production routines, and submission to entrepreneurial authority. To accomplish these changes the nation had to depend on the rubbish and the barbarians.

On one educational track, the rubbish could be shaped, the barbarians trained. Mechanics institutes, workshop classes, vocational training, trade counseling have, in time, cleared the way to work in mill and factory, shop, store, and office. For the mass of workers in the century of transition, higher learning lay in McGuffey's platitudes and a good Spencerian hand.

On another track, young men of means headed for the colleges and universities where they could pursue the beauties of mind and hand and learn the principles of power in government or business. Occasionally, the tracks threatened to cross. But danger was always averted.

As early as 1829, the working men of Philadelphia, through their first, tentative political parties, raised a clamor for free education and more leisure. In 1847 a proposal was made to found a city college in New York. The plan was opposed because, it was charged, it would represent "the determination of the pauper class to levy upon the active, industrious (and, if you please, the affluent) portion of the community, the expense of furnishing to the sons of the former, a college education."

Was it for vocational training that the workers of Philadelphia had cried out by putting education at the head of their list of demands? Was this the universal education Horace Mann called the "great equalizer of the condition of men" in his 1848 report? He knew what conditions prevailed in the New England mills when he insisted that "surely nothing but universal education can counterwork the tendency to the domination of capital and the servility of labor."

In the years following the Civil War, big business and the factory system triumphed. And they did so by diluting crafts and fragmenting skills. As the century ended, Frederick W. Taylor proclaimed that all work skills could be broken down scientifically into constituent body motions that would eliminate time-consuming decisions and controls by the worker, and by being timed, as the most efficient steps in production, would also eliminate the need for unions and bargaining. "Skills," writes the modern poet, James McMichael, "made a worker more intractable and less dependant."

Fragmented production meant fragmented human beings. We have known since Adam Smith defined the wealth of nations what are the benefits of fragmented production. But the father of free enterprise and the market mechanism had insisted, in a work entitled "Theory of Moral Sentiments," that a society must be based not only on competition; we must come to the market place with sympathy for the other fellow's plight.

We have, in our own lifetime, witnessed a reversal in industrial psychology. We have discovered that fragmented workers are not necessarily better, more efficient workers. T[illegible] has given way to human relations in the conduct of business and production. [illegible]n Imperial Germany seemed about to grasp victory in World War I, many in our country considered this to be a triumph for the specialist education and training that that nation's rulers had grafted on to the basic feudal structure of that land. One scholar found that by the time German children were ten years old they were well on their way to meeting "the demand of employers for efficient workers either equipped for specific processes or adaptable to factory methods."

The eminent psychologist and educator, G. Stanley Hall, perceived the dangers of fragmented, industrial education. Taking young people trapped in the New England shoe industry as an example, he proposed to prepare a "Shoe Book" that would cover their daily ordeal in the factory with a patina of romance. It would excite them with its account of the discovery of tanning. it would engross them with its description of the hygiene of the foot, it would enthrall them with a history of the shoe and legends about bootblacks and St. Crispin.

In reply to this, Helen Marot pointed out that anyone who knew the young men and women of the shoe towns also knew that if one of those towns established a library with books about the history of shoes, the aesthetics of shoes, shoe economics, shoe technology, etcetera, etcetera, not one person who worked in the factories, would darken its doors to read about shoes. "They would not for this simple reason: the workers' individual and vocational interest does not exist. They would say that they already knew more than they cared to about shoes. No literature could add culture or dignity to the job of stitching vamps for all the working hours and days of a wage earner's year."

At the time, it took ninety operations to make a shoe. Each operation was performed by a different worker. A worker's strength equalled one-ninetieth of a shoe.

It was this kind of fractionating of human skill and dignity that was at issue in the controversy between John Dewey and David Snedden that flared up in the pages of the New Republic in 1915. For some years a bill had been regularly introduced in the Illinois legislature calling for the establishment of a dual system of secondary schools. One would follow the academic route, the other the vocational.

The bill was vigorously defended by a coalition of business organizations headed by the Chicago Association of Commerce. It was just as vigorously opposed by the Chicago Federation of Labor. Dewey charged that a dual system would predestine most children to a life of labor, curbing personal development and social mobility. With the aid of Chicago teachers, the bill was repeatedly defeated.

I have dwelt at some length on the dichotomy in our educational philosophy because I feel that it is even more widespread today than it has been in the past. I see fragmentation in scholarship, in educational organization, in curricula, in vocational and career schooling. I have seen course bulletins as fat as Sears catalogues offering a kind of supermarket array of classes for all kinds of fragmented needs—even a shot of the Humanities—with no indication, even at the level of terminal schooling, of what integrative force will remain with the graduate to help him or her preserve personal integrity,

develop a degree of comprehensive understanding, preserve character and personality in a society that grows ever more complex, ever more divided.

Workers know what they want and it is not just vocational or career training. Back in 1883 Samuel Gompers, the president of the American Federation of Labor, was asked what labor wanted. He replied: "We want more school houses and less jails, more books and less guns, more learning and less vice, more leisure and less greed, more justice and less revenge. We want more opportunities to cultivate our better nature."

Soon after my own union, the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, had set up its own "university" in 1919 it was drawing crowded classes from the shops to its humanities courses—in the evenings after a long day's work. A deep hunger, unrelated to work or vocation, was satisfied by such teachers as Charles Beard, Wesley Mitchell, William F. Ogburn, Lindsay Rogers, Alvin Johnson, Stuart Chase. Workers doubled up in the classroom seats at the Washington Irving High School where the ILGWU University flourished to hear Babette Deutsch talk about Burns and Blake and Wordsworth or Carl Van Doren on the founding fathers or my old City College professor, Bird Stair, on Shaw and Wells and Galsworthy.

I first encountered the Stein-Whitehead theory of education in 1928 when I was graduated from the James Monroe High School in the East Bronx. Our family was already being battered by the depression that officially crashed through the following year.

Whitehead had urged that "we should aim at producing men who possess both culture and expert knowledge in some special direction." My father, making theory concrete, directed me to hunt for a job and "first learn a trade so you can make a living." He gave me a $5 graduation present and admonished me "to enroll at City College and learn what life really means."

I learned my trade of garment cutting in the shop. But at City College, first in evening classes and then in day sessions, I roamed the Humanities with scholars such as Bird Stair and J. Salwyn Schapiro and Morris Raphael Cohen. I no longer remember course titles and credits but through their scholarship, their understanding, their gifted articulation I came to know and love the treasured traits of our human condition: conscience and memory, the ability to communicate, the sense of right and wrong, the search for a just society and decent human relations, the sense of history, the sense of beauty, the critical examination of knowledge and belief.

I have come here to plead with you, the men and women who are at the helm of higher education, to restore the Humanities to their rightful place in our educational system. They are the compass by which alone we may be able to steer a course of survival. Today they are threatened. They have no cash value. All they may do is make better citizens, better human beings of us.

In last year's fall college enrollments, 24 percent of our national freshman class indicated the intention of majoring in business; only three percent intended to major in the Humanities. One percent intended to major in English but 6 percent plus were planning to make accounting the major interest in their lives.

I have nothing against business or accounting or garment cutting, for that matter. But we must ask ourselves if we are not becoming a nation in which learning and education—for hundreds of thousands of our young people—mean little more than learning

how to make a living, how to get ahead in business. There is the danger of becoming something little more than Japan where at least early schooling in poetry and art remain a countervailing force to the intensive integration of education, corporate enterprise, and the state; or the danger perhaps of becoming like Swift's Laputa, a country of floating computers extracting sunbeams from cucumbers.

Dr. Dille and I, along with two dozen other American citizens are engaged in a joint effort to rescue, preserve, and promote the Humanities. Four times a year, we gather as the National Council for the Humanities, to judge applications for grants within five major fields. Those applications come to us after elaborate and intensive review by peers in the pertinent humanities disciplines.

We function under a law enacted in 1965 that spells out our purpose and our procedures. We represent a variety of constituencies—public, private, academic, educational, media, etc. For our guidance we have a list of the Humanities as academic disciplines. For an entire day, we sit around a pit fishing for judgments, values, and definitions that go beyond academic purpose. It is a difficult task.

For these are days of budgetary cuts when values must find the cash nexus. Under pressure of cuts needed to make us stronger, if not wiser, academicians tend to retreat to inner sanctums of the campus, educators to basics in teaching, public spirited citizens to the more physical needs of disadvantaged parts of the population. Meanwhile, the impact of the humanities on a society that desperately needs their wisdom diminishes.

The worst danger of all is that we seem to be losing the sense of loss. Bright young men and women are launched into adult life as masters of slivers of life—trades, technologies, business administration, fast-food management, etc. Many have missed the warm embrace of the Humanities. Go back to your colleges and universities and help us—Dr. Dille, myself, and the others—to fulfill the Congressional mandate under which we labor: "to study and apply the humanities to the human environment with particular attention to the relevancy of the humanities to the current conditions of national life" because above and beyond all else, in the words of the 1965 legislation, "in its citizens, democracy demands wisdom and vision."

THE ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

The Honorable Terrel Bell
Secretary, U.S. Department of Education

I am glad to share a few thoughts with you. It is always a pleasure to meet with old friends and colleagues in the higher education community.

I am aware that finance is uppermost in your minds and, I admit, in mine as well. I understand and sympathize with your concerns about reduced federal spending for education, but it is something that must be done if we are to get the economy under control.

Despite some comments I have heard to the contrary, education is not being singled out to carry a greater burden in the budget-cutting process. We are taking our share of cuts and it hurts. But it will hurt a great deal more if we don't do something to curtail the profligate spending that has set inflation spiraling and made the dollars we do have worth very little.

The following is indicative. State support for higher education increased by 20 percent over the past two years. However, when adjustments are made for a jump of 25.3 percent in the Consumer Price Index in the same two years, state support is actually down by 4 percent. It goes without saying that the whole of America's economy is being battered by inflation and we have to stop it before it destroys us. It is an insidious problem—very real and very dangerous.

It is a fact that education will have to get by on less from the federal government. Getting by on less will require serious soul-searching in the establishment of priorities, more than a little creativity and, let's face it, in some instances, a profound struggle. I have faith that in that struggle, schools, colleges, and universities will never lose sight of their central purpose—to educate and to educate well.

There is, across this land, a renewed interest in and emphasis on the need for quality in education. But to demand quality is one thing and to produce it quite another.

The demand for quality is a realization—an admission—that its mark has not been met for quite awhile. We know we have missed the mark because, until this year, SAT scores had been on a steady downslide for 18 years in a row. Worse, there is ample evidence that many thousands of young Americans spend 12 years in our school system without having mastered the rudiments of reading, writing, or simple arithmetic. What a dismal waste or our most precious human resource! What a terrible thing to happen to a child's dream of accomplishment!

We know, too, that we have missed the mark of quality when the majority of our students do not have even a casual acquaintance with a foreign language. At the college level, students are shying away from the courses in math and science that gave this country its technological lead. We are going to lose that lead unless some changes are made in our educational expectations from kindergarten through graduate school.

Recently, in an article in The Washington Post, Jessica Tuchman Mathews reminded us that while we have seen unparalleled advances in science and technology over the past 20 years, "the United States in this period educated a tiny elite of the world's best scientists and engineers and left everyone else scientifically illiterate."

She stresses that just the opposite has been happening abroad. Today, she says, the Soviet Union's "compulsory curriculum for those finishing the equivalent of high school includes five years of physics, four of chemistry, five of biology, one of astronomy, five of geography, three of mechanical drawing, and ten of workshop training."

Compare these requirements, if you will, to what ordinarily is asked in this country of a college-bound high school student.

Ms. Mathews cites further statistics that show that the gap between our requirements and those of the USSR are just as great in mathematics. Similar academic demands are being made in Japan and West Germany. Unless we make some dramatic changes in what we expect our students to achieve, how can we hope to keep up with the rest of the world in science and technology, much less maintain any kind of lead!

I certainly am not suggesting a national compulsory curriculum, such as is found in countries with centralized systems of education. Anything compulsory through federal edict is anathema to Americans. We don't want anymore federal interference. There has been too much of it in recent years, and we are trying to put educational decision-making back where it belongs—in the hands of states, localities, and individuals.

But in order to produce quality, there is no reason for states or institutions not to develop reciprocal standards and expectations for education. There is no reason not to stiffen admissions standards at the higher education level so that high schools are forced to stiffen their own academic requirements.

Many secondary schools already are taking steps to improve academic preparedness. Witness the increased popularity of competency testing. In that example, however, two things must be borne in mind. Used wisely, competency testing can be very useful in determining whether the student has acquired the knowledge and skills necessary for success at the next step. But it also can be abused. The school has an obligation to be sure of what it is testing for and, when results are lower than they ought to be, an equal obligation to help the student come up to level.

Although it sometimes appears otherwise, the purpose of testing is to measure the achievement of the learner. It is not to punish. It would be unwise to forget that it also reflects the effectiveness of the school and the teaching staff.

Another piece of evidence pointing to the attempt to produce quality is the College Board's announcement, a few weeks ago, of a 10-year program to develop a national standard of achievement for high school students who plan to enter college, as well as a definition of competency as it relates to the student's ability to perform at the undergraduate level. The College Board is hopeful that high schools and colleges would adopt these standards, when they are developed, as measures of preparedness for higher education.

Excellence at the higher education level is dependent upon excellence at previous levels and states are beginning to give recognition of it. I understand, for example, that starting in 1982, Ohio's 12 state universities plan to accept unconditionally only those students who have taken college preparatory courses. This means four units of English

and three each of science, math, social studies, and foreign language. Some of you are probably having a sense of deja vu. So am I. But to change directions—to reach back—when you are obviously on the wrong track is the right thing to do.

This curriculum is not as stringent, perhaps, as you might find in some of the countries I have mentioned with centralized systems. But it doesn't have to be. It is the kind of thing that put us in the forefront of education and which has made our democratic, decentralized, and diverse system the envy of the world. The ever-increasing numbers of foreign students seeking entry into higher education here is evidence enough.

"The whole art of teaching," said Anatole France, "is only the art of awakening the natural curiosity of young minds for the purpose of satisfying it afterwards." That statement is as valid for higher education as for any other level. At every level, it is imperative that we appraise what we are doing to discover our weaknesses and make a firm commitment to educational credence. And, in any self-examination, a central question should be: Do we, in our classrooms, awaken natural curiosity, or do we put it to sleep forever. Every institution has an obligation to ensure that what is done in the formal education setting sharpens rather than dulls the desire to know.

Education is, of course, a two-way street. And, we can—indeed, should—require that students who enter our doors do so with a seriousness of purpose.

On opening day this year, American University's president, Richard Berendszen, told incoming freshmen, "If your principal motivation for coming to this university at this time is simply to get away from mom and dad and play for four years, do not unpack today—go elsewhere."

It is good advice. Education is too precious in terms of time and dollars to be taken lightly.

We have come a long way toward making higher education accessible to all who want and can benefit from it. The Nation can never waiver from that goal. Accessibility, however, cannot be used as an excuse for lack of excellence. A degree too easily earned is a mockery. It does nothing to enhance the student, the education system, or society.

In light of tightened budgets, there are other matters of deepest concern in American education that call for our attention. We know, for example, that the centers of excellence on many campuses are being seriously threatened by the inclination to centralize control in the name of cost effectiveness. I am referring to what is becoming a trend to create multicampus universities. This, I believe is a well intended but misguided attempt to achieve equality among unequals.

When central office bureaucrats and statehouse or Washington politicians, however well meaning, become overly zealous in this regard, they kill initiative and stunt the spirit of those who would reach up and out and push back the frontiers of knowledge. The better campuses necessarily decline in such an attempt and it is the worst kind of injustice.

I ask, what happens to the original university campus as it struggles to maintain and enhance its tradition of excellence and distinction in a centrally controlled, multicampus system?

I fear that their identities are leveled and education becomes homogenized and standardized in a mass production, cope-with-numbers, treat-all-the-same, formula-driven-dollars, method of control and governance.

Can we, especially in times of budget constraints, be creative enough to let the pinnacles of excellence stand and strive to draw the lowest up to the level of the highest, or will the reverse occur to the pain and detriment of all campuses in the system? This is an extremely significant question that must raise concerns about where higher education in the United States is heading.

Your states will make the decisions and provide the answers. These are not problems that should be solved by an infusion of federal funds, even if funds were available. And they are not. It is highly unlikely that there will be new federal monies or programs in the foreseeable future.

We have talked for many years about institutional versus student aid. Realistically, though, they are one and the same insofar as their benefit to institutions is concerned. But, unless the country is willing to bankrupt the entire federal education effort, we now will have to rely on fewer student aid dollars. Here, I refer primarily to the Guaranteed Student Loan Program. It has been obvious for some time that the program is too costly to maintain in its present form.

Loan volumes leapfrogged after passage of the Middle Income Student Assistance Act—to $2.9 billion in fiscal year 1979 to $4.8 billion in 1980 and to $8 billion in 1981. We are locked into interest and special allowance payments on that exorbitant three-year volume for a long way down the road and to additional billions of dollars of unmatured paper carried over from earlier years. The cost is mighty. For the quarter ending September 30, for instance, we paid out 19½ percent on every loan dollar which had not yet entered repayment status. We estimate that these subsidies will cost the government $3 billion or maybe even more this year, depending upon what happens to the yield on 91-day Treasury bills.

This says that, even if lending were to cease tomorrow, the cost of the GSL subsidies for several years ahead will remain greater than the sums Congress appropriated this year to support the three campus-based programs and greater also than the amount of money distributed through the Pell Grant program in any year since its inception.

The criteria for need on a subsidized GSL, in effect since October 1, is a joke. The formula is so liberal some students can borrow the maximum even though their families have incomes in excess of $100,000. If a family at that level needs help, it ought to be in the form of a course in financial management.

The intent of federal student financial assistance is to meet student need, not to subsidize families who choose to use their funds for purposes other than for the education of their children. The administration has proposed legislative changes that will return the primary responsibility for financing education where it belongs—to the parents and the student. Only when the family is financially unable to carry out its responsibility will education be subsidized with public tax dollars.

Much of our strength is derived from the ability to adjust, to "make do" when the going gets rough. I have no doubt at all that with your considerable management skills, state colleges and universities will meet the challenge inherent in a revised financial base. It won't be easy. But the battle won will be worth the effort.

VISIONS . . . DECISIONS . . . REAL LEADERSHIP

Reatha Clark King
President
Metropolitan State University, Minnesota

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Since the announcement of the program for this meeting, several of you asked me if I had my speech ready. Now that the occasion is here, I can share with all of you my opinion that no president can ever consider a speech for a group of fellow presidents finished. Until the last minute, I have felt apprehensive, first because of the tremendous respect I have for you, my colleagues, and second because of the tremendous responsibility presidents have. Those who have never been presidents do not understand either the responsibility or the complexity of our work; those of us serving as presidents constantly seek to understand our work better so we can make a greater impact, so we can provide real presidential leadership. These days, some frustrations beset us in that attempt, and this meeting will help us deal with them.

In this address, I neither try to challenge what previous writers have said nor promise to add significantly to the vast literature on presidential leadership. I simply wish to expand our capacity to identify and assess presidential work. To many it will seem that I am describing what presidential work should be, rather than what it is. Well, that should be all right because our theme for the meeting, "VISIONS . . . and DECISIONS," challenges us to dream a little. Without dreams, we will not have much vision.

One implication of the theme is that we are not really happy with the way others perceive us. These days, our work keeps us so entangled in bureaucracy that others sometimes view us as mere administrators. We are justifiably troubled by that perception, for we would rather be perceived as leaders, anticipating change before it happens and dealing effectively with it when it does come.

According to March and Cohen in their study of the college presidency, Leadership and Ambiguity, presidents who would act as leaders face four ambiguities: ambiguity of purpose, ambiguity of power, ambiguity of experience, and ambiguity of success. March and Cohen base their book on in-depth interviews with a sample of college and university presidents. Their report reflects the experiences of presidents in their sample. Since experience is reality, it is difficult to challenge what March and Cohen report. I do assert, however, that we cannot afford to be ambiguous about our purposes if we are to be perceived as leaders. Furthermore, I argue that the purposes of real leaders are not ambiguous.

Regarding institutional goals, March and Cohen note the following:

> Almost any educated person can deliver a lecture entitled 'The Goals of the University.' Almost no one will listen to the

lecture voluntarily. For the most part, such lessons and their companion essays are well intended exercises in social rhetoric, with little operational content.

> Efforts to generate normative statements of the goals of a university tend to produce goals that are either meaningless or dubious. They fail one or more of the following reasonable tests. First, is the goal clear? Can we define some specific procedure for measuring the degree of goal achievement? Second, is it problematic? Is there some possibility that the organization will accomplish the goal? Is there some chance it will fail? Third, is it accepted? Do most significant groups in the university agree on the goal statement? For the most part, the level of generality that facilitates acceptance destroys the problematic nature or clarity of the goal. The level of specificity that permits measurements destroys acceptance. [1]

These words express what we know from our campus experiences: that institutional goals are subject to debate by campus constituent groups. But there is another set of goals that are <u>not</u> subject to debate. These develop out of the higher purposes that symbolize <u>real</u> leadership.

Each president can make his or her own list of higher purposes and guiding ideals. But there are four which, in my opinion, should be on any list. These I challenge you to accept and to advocate and pursue in behalf of others:

- educational opportunity
- freedom
- social justice and human rights for individuals
- domestic and world peace.

In a literal sense, the higher goals that I urge upon you are ambiguous. But their ambiguity dissipates and their focus become sharp with our increasing commitment to achieve them.

Who will raise our aspirations for achieving these goals? We must do that ourselves, by our continuous vision, reaffirmations, decisions, and deeds. That these ideals sound like dreams is good. Without dreams that we want to be true, there can be little vision with our leadership.

---

[1] Cohen, Michael D. and James G. March, <u>Leadership and Ambiguity</u> (McGraw Hill Book Co.: New York, 1974), p. 195. This is a general report prepared for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education.

Certain characteristics make these ideals especially appealing. First, we need neither to debate nor to negotiate their acceptance with our constituent groups. Second, these purposes are good for all decades, not just the 1980s. Third, they give us common cause with leaders in labor, business, other government agencies, health, and other service sectors. As a result, we become recognized as leaders for higher education, not just in higher education. Fourth, these ideals are the end result of the work of our institutions rather than just the means to the end. Fifth and most important, these higher purposes are conceived in terms of the needs, rights, and privileges of the people our institutions serve.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

As presidents, securing educational opportunity for people is our highest public responsibility. To some, the words "educational opportunity" sound trite, perhaps boring, because we hear them so much. But the public we apply them to keeps changing as more people come forth wanting to be served. This influx of new people seeking "educational opportunity" keeps the words vital, and even exciting. The charge to AASCU presidents is strong and direct, not only because we are so close to the public but because our institutions were established by the public specifically to make quality higher education accessible to people.

Most of our institutions are now surrounded by changing publics. Some of our communities have changed from White to Black and then from Black to Chicano-Latino or Puerto Rican. In my own case, our public has Whites, Blacks, Chicanos, other Hispanics, Hmong, Vietnamese, American Indians, and new refugees that we still must get to know. It is my duty to know who they are, to seek resources that make educational opportunity a reality for those who wish to come. It is our duty to defend people's right to education, and to try to motivate those who do not understand the value of an education in our society.

Each day I, along with other minorities of my generation, carry memories of past experiences that illustrate the preciousness of educational opportunity for people. Don't worry, I will not bore you by describing those hardships. The older I get the less fun it is to recall them. But while the bitterness of these experiences has largely faded, the vitality they gave to the words "educational opportunity" will never wane, and the freedom that I secured as a result of these opportunities will be cherished forever.

Colleagues have often asked which meant more to me, the experience of being in the classroom once I got there, or the opportunity to be there. Like many younger and older students today, I knew I could do the work once I got in, but removing the obstacles to getting in was the problem. Cost was only one of the obstacles. Even with parental support, with the few jobs that students like me could find, and with the scholarship aid, there were not enough funds for students to pay their bills to institutions.

It is sometimes humorous to recall personnel who enjoyed reputations based on their skills for sorting people, and yet too often, in my opinion, they unjustly excluded those who aspired either to become a part of or to remain in the college or university.

These efficient administrators went about their work with short-term goals, specific rules and regulations that they enforced with style. But the presidents—especially Dr. James Brawley, then president at Clark College (who approved of my taking my final examination when my bill to the institution was not paid)—had longer term goals and higher visions in mind. They were leaders who understood the injustices perpetrated by exclusion, and who championed educational opportunity for me and others.

Today, the AASCU president must be committed still to championing the inclusion rather than the exclusion of people from higher education. Let us seek to remove the barriers. It is understood that we will work to ensure quality educational services to all people. No one needs another handicap. Today's barriers to educational opportunity are more subtle than those of the past. We became used to the older barriers of race, sex, and inflexible admissions criteria; now we recognize additional barriers of inflexible programs and institutions, inadequate support services for students, and the continuing and more direct one of cost. The barrier of cost might be perceived or real. Either sense of it can hinder the aspirer to educational opportunity. With more people seeking inclusion than ever before, we all should be strong advocates of government support for student financial aid. As the list of barriers lengthens, we must become stronger champions of educational opportunity for people. Whatever the obstacles might be, real leaders for higher education will remain able and willing to champion their removal.

FREEDOM

People have written in various studies and reports about the benefits of education to individuals and to society. The extrinsic gains traceable to education are generally materialistic and observable; the more obvious ones are 1) increased income, 2) opportunity for better housing, 3) more travel, 4) leisure time enrichments, 5) more rational and humane family planning. Our intrinsic list will include a better quality of life and greater tolerance of other people. Clearly, these are important benefits of an education. But all lists of such benefits that I have seen so far have omitted what I believe is the most important benefit of becoming educated: a stronger sense of freedom.

Becoming educated puts individuals more in control of what happens to them over time. One can use education to create choices, open up options, and escape pain that could come from harassment by others. Education is an important means to freedom.

Through our institutions, we are helping people become able, through their individual efforts, to rise above most obstacles to a higher quality of life. The education we help them achieve enables them to deal with injustices, both intended and unintended. Education strengthens a person's ability to liberate him or herself from problems that would keep them at the mercy of others if not dealt with.

I move about Minnesota a lot using various modes of transportation—car, plane, bus. There was a time, while growing up in Georgia, when I detested the bus . . . first, because it had restricted seating (I had to sit in the back), and second, because it was the only form of transportation I could afford. Now I enjoy the bus. It is quick, economical, nondiscriminatory, and convenient (within walking distance of my office); but

most of all I feel good about riding it because I can choose to ride something else. Now every time I enter the station I am overcome by a very precious feeling of freedom. It started with education.

As we have recognized diversity in our society, varied groups have come forward expecting their rights to be respected. We will have both small and large conflicts as we attempt to meet everyone's expectations. Strengthening civil rights laws will help us deal with some of the problems in the future, especially after people really start exercising their responsibility to vote. Laws will deter unjust treatment of people. But individuals must have greater capacity to cope. We are not able to hold every minority's hands to deal with the daily problems of harassment. We cannot hold every woman's hand to deal with sexual harassment problems by men. We cannot hold every man's hand to deal with sexual harassment by women. I cannot follow my teenage boys through the world or the neighborhood to make sure that they are not harassed by the police—and it is a fact that young boys, especially minorities, do suffer harassment at the hands of the police.

We must educate people, make economic opportunity a reality, and then send them forth with a hope that they can better fend for themselves. With an education, they will do all right. They will be more able to liberate themselves from problems, and thus experience an enhanced sense of freedom. I have made this transition over my lifetime and I cannot describe for you how precious a feeling it is.

Education remains our best means of ensuring people's freedom. Securing this benefit for individuals should be one of our ideals, a special purpose of our work as presidents. Whether our students major in engineering, nursing, English, or some other discipline or profession becomes important as we help our institutions meet society's needs. But we have various deans and faculty who will worry about and monitor the students' program affiliations. Our special concern as presidents should be whether the overall services provided by our institutions are strengthening our students' abilities to emancipate themselves from obstacles to their freedom, whether they will have more choices when they leave us than they had before they came.

SOCIAL JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

The present emphasis on removal of government regulations that enforce civil rights and eliminate discrimination should prompt us to reaffirm our commitment to social justice and human rights for individuals and to strengthen our capacity for self-regulation. Without self-regulation and strong commitment to affirmative action, we will certainly see an erosion of progress in social justice.

The wheel of justice has always turned slowly. The rate of progress increased with the great vision and work of Martin Luther King, Jr., Roy Wilkins, and other prominent civil rights, labor, and women's movement leaders. I believe that the government pressures have helped. Let's imagine for a moment in which direction this wheel of justice will turn if the forward pressures are removed. It can only roll in reverse, given the frictional forces of bigotry, prejudice, and overt discrimination that work to retard social progress.

In recent years, real progress was made in dealing with these problems. The laws helped to deal with overt discrimination, and the powerful work of civil rights leaders somewhat overshadowed the forces of bigotry and prejudice. To say that the work in civil rights only muted the loud voices of bigotry and prejudice recognizes that the latter forces are terrible societal diseases; these diseases are very difficult to cure. Certainly some positive change occurred in the hearts of many of people during the last decade, but it is clear now that the basic problems affecting civil rights were not solved, they were only subdued.

The media have given considerable attention in recent months to the rise of bigotry, antisemitism, the new tide of conservatism and longing for the "good old days." These traditional obstacles to social justice are now joined with the multifaceted attacks by the "moral majority." It is difficult for me to judge whether these forces are working together or separately. It is clear that they pose a threat that we cannot ignore. If President Giamatti's analysis is correct, the threat the moral majority poses to the rights of others is more serious than most of us realize. He says that

> The 'moral majority' is a cry of exhaustion, a longing for surcease from the strain of managing complexity. Those voices of coercion speak not for liberty but for license, the license to divide in the name of patriotism, the license to deny in the name of christianity, and they have licensed a new meanness of spirit in our land, a resurgent bigotry that manifests itself in racist and discriminatory postures; in threats of political retaliation; in injunctions to censorship; in acts of violence.
>
> The issue is that a reactionary mood, preying on the fears of those who feel dispossessed by change and bypassed by complexity, is growing and that there is a moral imperative, rooted in America's best traditions, to identify it and call for a cleansing of the air.[2]

I believe that today's obstacles to human rights are equally complex and more formidable than those we have faced in the past. We must deal with these new obstacles, and how should we start? The best starting point is within our own institutions. The big question is whether we as presidents are ready and willing on a voluntary basis and through our own initiative to work hard to counteract the forces that continue in both subtle and overt ways to obstruct the rights of women, minorities, as well as others. To succeed, we certainly must have leadership with commitment—commitment to affirmative action in the educational services and employment practices of our institutions.

---

[2] "On The Legitimacy of Difference," A Bartlett Giamatti, Minneapolis Tribune. September 11, 1981. (Excerpt of address to entering freshmen class of Yale University.)

After several years of so-so efforts by institutions, and lots of public debate on whether affirmative action does more harm than good for equal opportunity employment, we still find great need for affirmative action in our colleges and universities. Without the push of the external forces that many of us wish to eliminate, progress will come only as a result of our vision and a sincere enough commitment to social progress for us to regulate ourselves and achieve some results. Most of us will agree that protecting civil rights is everybody's responsibility, and to have agreement on this point is all so well and good. But how much initiative will we show for affirmative action? Will we just wait for the overqualified women and minorities to show up before we are willing to appoint them? Or will we reach out and search for women and minority candidates? Will we be willing to go another step and deal with the subtle prejudices?

One of these relates to age discrimination and it concerns me greatly. Looking at women especially, we can see that we have taking place today a system of differentiating justice according to ages of the aspirants. Like younger women, mature women—generally middle-aged women—are eagerly preparing themselves for the new options—jobs, careers, freedom—all the good things they were denied in the past either because of discrimination or because they were willing to do instead what society sanctioned. Many of them are returning to complete their education at various levels—high schools, colleges, and universities. We find that these women typically have difficult financial burdens: children they must support in addition to educational expenses. Many of them are divorced and have been put to future economic disadvantage because of biased laws governing insurance and retirement benefits. They generally show a good-natured anger or regret about having restricted themselves to stereotyped roles that "conditioned" them to future insecurity in dealing with educational, social, and professional matters outside of the home.

As they complete their education and seek to participate in the new options for women, these women deserve consideration. We are very proud of the fact that many more women are enrolled in colleges and universities and professional schools than ever before. But we must challenge the attitude that the imbalance of women in certain professional jobs will be corrected when the younger women are ready for the job market. Should we keep denying justice to the mature women who wish consideration? The answer is "no." Mature women should not be denied just treatment all their lives. If you happen to work consciously or unconsciously with some differential system for just treatment of women, please try to get rid of it. Let us manifest our sincerity about social justice in behalf of all ages.

There exists today some local pressure on most presidents of colleges and universities to help achieve affirmative action. Let's welcome it. The climate for affirmative action is enhanced by activities within our communities as well as by those on our campuses. These community efforts are at the "grass-roots" level, seeking the elimination of discrimination on the basis of sex in broader society as well as in programs and activities in all levels of educational systems. They exist in churches, YMCA's, community centers, drama groups, libraries, women's clubs, and business organizations. We have lots of these voluntary grass-roots organizations in behalf of women, but not nearly enough in behalf of civil rights for minorities.

The impact of the work of women's organizations can readily be seen when we compare the results from Title IX after six years with the results from other legislation for social change. For minorities, the situation today would be different if the Supreme Court desegregation decision of 1954 and the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 had been followed by the voluntary formation of a large number of grass-roots groups working alongside established civil rights organizations to increase society's acceptance of integration and to eliminate racial discrimination. Wouldn't it be amazing to have a network of new groups form voluntarily to help eliminate racial discrimination in society?

In our leadership roles we want to encourage these community efforts. Let us welcome rather than fear the pressure these groups place on our institutions to provide more effective employment and educational services for people. Visits by minority groups in particular to lobby and pressure for their causes are good. This shows that they are active and interested and want to work with us. If they show anger, it can often be transformed to constructive energy for accomplishing mutual goals. Working with these groups provides opportunities for us to do creative planning and decision-making. The absence of pressure or demands from minorities should worry us. If there is such an absence, then the reasons for it are worth investigation. All cannot be well with us so soon.

DOMESTIC AND WORLD PEACE

Without a constant effort to educate our people, we can neither maintain domestic peace nor propose good approaches for maintaining world peace. The turmoil of the 1960s should have impressed upon us the value of attending to people so they will seek solutions to problems by reasoning rather than revolution. Today, with the gap in ownership of property so obvious, deprived people will become impatient, and we should not be altogether surprised if these deprived and unattended people do vent their frustration through violence.

How can we help lower frustrations and restore hope for such people? I know no better way than by making educational opportunity a reality for them. Even with much talk about the number of dollars that we have spent in the past, and that we are spending now to educate people, it is clear that investing to educate people is still our most sensible and effective approach to a peaceful pluralistic democratic society. Every alternative approach I can think of is more expensive. Although we can rebuild burnt cities (if funds are available), it takes longer for each of us to overcome our own feelings of guilt. It takes even longer for our country to close the credibility gap as we seek to export our human rights doctrine to other countries.

We will have tensions as a larger variety of groups emerge in our communities. We have Cubans, the arrival of more Haitians, the Vietnamese, Hmong people on top of our continuing efforts to learn how to live with grieved Blacks, American Indians, Mexican-American people, Puerto Ricans. More groups will come. We will continue to fear disorder. My experience is that all people, regardless of their differences from you

and me, want to contribute to society through jobs, and they want to be treated with dignity and respect. While they must take some responsibility for achieving these objectives themselves, it is up to you and me to help them get an education. Education is the most important enabling resource we have.

For improved human relations, our educational services should be targeted at two groups. One of these is the disadvantaged group that feels it has little or no control over its fate and has therefore become impatient and violence-prone. The other targeted group should be all the rest of society. All of us must work on accepting others, and learn how to accept those different from ourselves in dress, skin color, culture, speech, and national origin. Continuous education, both formal and informal, of everybody is important to improve tolerance of others and to eliminate prejudice. Prejudice is pervasive, invisible, and difficult to control. Its elimination is a far-reaching ideal, but this ideal is worth striving for.

Our concern for world peace should be no less than our concern for domestic harmony. Given the present national priority for military build-up, we as a group might well feel powerless when we question if there is real need for such a build-up of weapons. Yet it does remain our responsibility to question the need and even to discourage the build-up when it becomes clear that our country has misprioritized. While I can understand the need to ensure national security, I would like to see us avoid unnecessary build-up of weapon systems. How much is enough? Are they really needed? Must we choose either to reindustrialize or to invest to improve the quality of life for people? With the emphasis on nuclear weapons, shouldn't we worry about whether there will be life, let alone life with quality?

A recent feature story in Time magazine pointed out that the developed countries—the United States, England, Russia, West Germany, Italy, and France—are busily at work arming the world, exporting weapons to the Third World countries. The situation "is out of control with no limits in sight." The article noted that "the spread of conventional weaponry threatens stability in every region of the world." Those of us here should be further alarmed by the introduction of these sophisticated weapons to children. Under a picture of two armed little boys walking the jungle in Cambodia, the caption read, "The only excuse seems to be that others are doing it too."

This problem is complex and I have no immediate solution to propose. I feel troubled; all of us should feel concerned. AASCU has served us well by its very fine missions to other countries. As a result of those, we should certainly have some thoughts about world peace. But on our campuses it is not easy for us to give serious attention to matters related to world survival. We are preoccupied by matters related to the survival of our institutions. If we are leading with vision, however, we must concern ourselves with world peace and prospects for world survival; our thoughts and concerns must extend beyond our local regions.

Going beyond the issue of peace, human rights in other countries should be our concern also. We are committed to the freedom and the dignity of people. Although these countries might seem distant, we must be concerned about human rights everywhere because, as the late Martin Luther King, Jr., warned in his 1963 letter from the Birmingham Jail, "injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere."

Because various countries embrace different ideologies and because each of us will be more interested in some countries than in others, it will be difficult for us as a group of presidents to have a unanimous position on human rights issues for all countries. While some of us will be interested in matters related to Russia, others will show more interest in what goes on in South Africa, others will be interested in Argentina. That diffusion of interest is all right. Rather than debate these differences, let us follow our consciences and help our government, corporate boards, and chosen groups bring about humane treatment of all people abroad as well as at home.

Again, I restate the four ideals that I think are most important for leadership by college and university presidents. We should champion educational opportunity for people; we should understand education as a means of securing people's freedom; we should advocate justice and human rights for all people, and we should promote domestic and world peace.

Actually, it might not be so important that we endorse one set of ideals as it is for us to have whatever ideals we follow out front so our constituents, both on and off campus, know what they are.

THE IMPORTANCE OF COMMITMENT

It is important for each of us to examine the commitment we bring to these idealistic purposes. Our belief in these ideals should be strong before we are presidents, while we are presidents, and when we are no longer presidents. Our commitment has to be manifested when we have money in our budgets, and especially when the funding is reduced; when our enrollments are achieved as planned and when they decline; when our faculty and other administrators agree with us, and when they do not. We have to accept certain ideals as valid over all times—the 1980s, the 1990s, and whenever—in all states and in all communities, urban and rural. They are applicable to the needs of the total public, not just the rich, not just the minorities, not just the women, not just the men. There has to be a steadfast commitment to our ideals; otherwise we will be seen as just spewing out fashionable rhetoric when it suits our purposes.

THE NECESSITY OF RISK

What if our constituent groups do not agree with our own ideals? Certainly at times we will arrive at decisions that some of our constituents do not like. Quite commonly, these decisions relate to program innovations and reaching out to new clientele. Opposition is often understandable, for most people are comfortable with the status quo, the familiar. In our work, however, our decisions and actions are driven by commitment and we are attracted to the unfamiliar. My experiences show that some risk is necessary if we are to lead with vision. We will decide whether and when to act in the face of opposition. And, as many of us in this audience have experienced, our doubters will support us as the answers to their questions unfold. If colleges and universities had all answers to questions and solutions to problems before we were hired, then they

really would not need presidential leaders. They could get along very well with administrators; they would make out all right with "neutral academics."

REASON FOR OPTIMISM

The higher education community is gloomy today, and has been for some time as a result of the turmoil within the community around civil rights, the Vietnam war, and the budget crises. But there is one main reason for optimism—we are entrusted with the most important enabling resource that any country provides for its people. We control the hope, the fate, the ability to be free for so many people. We are the channel to their economic freedom, their social contentment, and ultimately their peace of mind. We are important; our faculties are important; other employees of our institutions are important. This is the case in good and bad budget cycles. Those higher purposes should keep us optimistic.

CREDIT FOR SUCCESS?

If we are leading with vision and creativity, the questions of who gets credit for our accomplishments, where and by whom they are acknowledged should be the least of our concerns. Most likely the credit for successes on higher goals will be given to the person who follows us in the job, and not to us while we are in office. This should not worry us because as most of us were appointed to office, some people immediately began crediting us for decisions and accomplishments that our predecessors set in motion. At Metropolitan State, many of the successful things that we do today were initiated by Dr. Sweet. Perhaps my mistake when I started this job was that I tried to correct people when they complimented me, encouraging them to credit him. I do not anymore because I know that my successor will be credited for whatever good long-range decisions I make. Worry about who gets the credit might be an indication that our decision-making is too focused on the near term. Short-run successes are numerous and the good feedback is helpful. But are they the successes that we really want to be credited for in the long run? The more I become preoccupied with short-run successes and winning "the little battles" in my institution, the more I become entangled in administration and bureaucracy. Every time it happens, I find that the time would have been better used if applied to the bigger problems, even if someone else will get the credit for solutions to such problems.

WHICH GOALS TO FOLLOW?

In reality, we must be guided by two or more sets of purposes. Besides the higher purposes I have spoken of, there are those that occupy most of our routine thinking; these are the institution's mission and goals that we share and look to for direction along with the various constituent groups of the institution. And then there are those

goals related to the administrative processes of the institution. Thus, we actually have three sets of goals directing our work:

- ideals
- institutional mission and goals
- administrative objectives

I have taken much of your time to emphasize the prime importance of the ideals, for they are the ends to which institutional goals and administrative objectives are but the means.

The institutional mission and goals are important guides for presidential work. We have helped to shape them. We believe in them. We articulate them well to the public even when they are ambiguous. We facilitate the work of administrators and faculty who accomplish them. Nevertheless, if these are the only substantive goals that guide our work as presidents, we will continue to be unfulfilled as leaders. We must see a relationship between the higher goals and our local institutional goals. I view the institutional goals as a means of achieving our main purposes.

I must return now to emphasize the importance of administration in our institutions; it is useful for orderly communications, justifying funding, and many other reasons we know. Matters related to curriculum, staffing, physical plants, and athletic programs will and should continue to get a certain amount of our attention, whatever the outcome of this meeting. Fundraising, legal matters, and accountability for the use of all funds are more difficult questions to deal with and they will consume more of our time. But to avoid becoming bound and frustrated by the increasing burden of administration, we must put these matters in perspective. The more we can get others to accept the fact that these matters are the means to achieving the bigger goals, the better we will be able to separate the substantive issues from the administrative details and then divide our labor accordingly.

Naturally, we presidents want to deal with the substantive questions, rather than the administrative details, and to deal with the substantive questions for the long run. It takes lots of daily sorting to keep us on track—to keep us from becoming buried in bureaucracy. Among the various items vying for our attention, let us remember the importance of knowing who our students are and understanding the substantive benefits they are realizing from their work at our institutions. We need this knowledge to be able to convince others to maintain funding for higher education and to deal with our responsibility to advocate educational opportunity. The better we prepare to do this daily, the better we can do it in times of financial crisis such as that we are now facing in Washington and in our own states.

SOUNDING LIKE A HAPPY WARRIOR

If I sound like another happy warrior from Minnesota, it is perhaps because of the nature of my institution as well as my strong belief in certain ideals. It is easier for me

to think about separating the substance of management from administration, because my institution, by design, is stripped of the bureaucracy that most of yours are forced to deal with. As authorized by the state legislature, with the advocacy of the late Dr. G. Theodore Mitau, Metropolitan State operates with no formal campus, no dormitories, no fraternities or sororities, no parking lots, no cafeterias, no bands or choruses, and no athletic teams. There is, however, the threat of budget cuts and a smaller state appropriation for next year. Possibly, we have at least this experience in common.

But seriously, we are stripped of form and have only the substance of an educational institution's work—our programs and the students we serve—and we feel pressure to be conscious of those who need education and are not being served. Everyone at the university concentrates on defining what makes an educated person, perfecting the delivery of educational services to students, designing new techniques to meet needs of enrolled students, and planning new strategies to accommodate people who would like to improve their education but who find neither our approach nor the approaches of other institutions convenient for their needs. It is my personal goal to keep "a low bureaucracy situation" for the benefit of our students. It has been my good fortune to be forced to sort the goals that guide my work—in the same way that Dr. Mitau had to do as he tried to get others to accept his dream and help establish a new kind of university.

By "happy warrior," I am also referring to the late Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, whom I admired for his ideals. I believe he would have been especially proud of two recent developments in AASCU—the first is the recognition and appreciation for the work of spouses of presidents. The second is the appointment of more women as presidents of AASCU-type institutions. I am sure he would have been very proud to know that this warrior is Black and female. Now following those compliments, I have a question: Why did you men have to let times get so hard, with these budget crises and all our other problems, before you were willing to accept women presidents?

GREAT OPPORTUNITIES FOR LEADERSHIP

As presidents of AASCU institutions, we are in a great position to make a difference in the quality of life of lots of people, and to help with solutions to local, national, and international problems. We are astride the country. We are in touch with every national issue, and more importantly, we are in touch either directly or indirectly with all the people.

There were 349 member institutions in 1980-81, and we served well over two million people living in every section of the country. We are situated close to the people, perfectly placed for leadership with vision and creativity. This closeness to people is an important source of power for carrying out our work. We can make a difference.

Let us return to our institutions and begin to separate out the substantive from the administrative questions and take advantage of our unique opportunities for leadership.

PARTNERS STILL!

Marguerite Walker Corbally
Author

I had some difficulty preparing my remarks because of the necessity for giving consideration to a few male spouses. Understandably, I have seen the situation we are discussing today through a woman's eyes. I realize that many of the emotional and psychological pressures which come to bear on the president and the president's family impact similarly on the spouse whether the spouse is male or female; however, much of what I perceive to be the job of the wife of a president involves operating an official home. Burdened as I am by hundreds of years of stereotyping, I assume that male spouses are not running official homes or functioning as unpaid employees of the school or college. Meanwhile, I find the word spouse unattractive. It sounds like a growth. Alternating his and hers is cumbersome. Since the men here are so greatly outnumbered, all ought to understand if I persist in thinking of the chief executive officer as a man and the person trying hard to support all of his efforts in his work while maintaining all of their personal and family concerns, as a woman. I would appreciate it if you would supply the his or hers as necessary.

For the past 12 years, most of my speeches have been designed to convince my audience that being the wife of a college or university president was a full-time job. Frequently, I had an audience of one . . . my husband. On other occasions the audience included university presidents, their trustees, students, faculty, faculty wives, graduate students and their wives, and members of the community-at-large. All doubted that being married to a college president involved anything more than just "keeping house" and enjoying the perquisites of the position. I was seldom able to convince them otherwise as the outline of my job eluded me. Which were truly my responsibilities? Was I taking more on myself than necessary? Was I accomplishing successfully the things for which I was truly responsible? When I had so few answers for myself, I could not be very convincing to others. That was when I decided to do the study which resulted in my book. I was searching for a job description which would enable all concerned to understand the wife's position and provide her the support services she required to meet her obligations. I found very few women able to describe their jobs well, yet practically all knew they were working full-time for the benefit of the school. Even when the study showed that women were spending more than 55 hours per week on official duties, I found skepticism on the part of their constituents. The attitude I usually met was that the women must be exaggerating or they must be incompetent.

I do not have to convince this audience that there is a job to be done and that it is a complex one. Most of us are still struggling for a concept and definition of our jobs. And trying, without success, to separate the job from our private lives. While I have not abandoned my efforts to educate trustees, husbands, and communities, I long

since recognized that the real source of assistance for us has to come from each other and from better preparation for our jobs through groups such as this one.

I would like to talk about the complexities of our situation to help everyone understand the breadth of our responsibilities and the peculiar way in which our obligations and opportunities present themselves as opposite sides of the same coin. In doing so, I am drawing upon my own experience, upon the results of the questionnaire responses I received from almost 250 people serving in the role, and upon the results of the study done with spouses of AASCU presidents.

Some of our constituents might acknowledge that we are "keeping house" on a grand scale, but they assume that we have help—making our day easier than theirs. They do not comprehend the scope of our responsibilities—that many of them cannot be rejected—and that having help increases our sense of responsibility rather than diminishes it. The notion that some of us are doing a great deal of work for our schools without any help at all is simply not to be believed. Some people think the help is there to serve our breakfast in bed and would be surprised at the truth—that their presence eliminates all possibility of our sleeping late once in awhile.

Presidents don't always understand why we are tired, uncertain, and harassed. In fact, the most bewildered and misinformed person in the community is probably the president. He thinks he has the tough job. He did not foresee how completely his job would affect his wife. He may have understood that he would need her help as never before. He might even have suspected that she would not be happy with the demands his job would make on his time, but he never guessed at the size of the job waiting for her hidden in the responsibilities he accepted when he was sworn in. He thinks his wife ought to appreciate his success and the accompanying "perks" of a place of honor in the community, a home of distinction with a maid to do all unpleasant and repetitive tasks. Instead, he will find the maid will quit on the same day the governor makes drastic cuts in the school budget and both are somehow his fault. He may even wonder briefly which event was the more catastrophic. The most sensitive and thoughtful husband may not be around when needed, since everyone else has first claim on his time. His wife, who is both brave and resourceful, will carry on her scheduled entertainment without the maid, but her guests will wonder why she seems preoccupied, why she didn't have her hair done, and why she is so bad at remembering names. Her husband may wonder why she doesn't appreciate all of her fine opportunities.

I believe our own uncertainty about our jobs is at the root of much of the discomfort and dissatisfaction we experience. More than half of the women in my study reported that the responsibilities of the position of president's wife were greater than they had anticipated. Few felt prepared to do the job. Combine this frame of mind with the attitude of most people we meet that we have an easy, even as enviable life, and it is no wonder that we sometimes question our own competence. If we are so competent, why are our desks always piled high with work? If we are so lucky, why don't we have time to read or play the piano, or visit our grandchildren as our friends do? If we're so pampered, why are we so tired? Is being tired somehow a sign of our incompetence? Is it our fault our schedules are less than satisfying?

We are lucky but the stack of books to be read may have to wait for a sabbatical. We know the benefits of our lives better than anyone and do not need to be told what

those are. We may be tired but we are competent. We expect a lot of ourselves. We are strivers and we are proud. We do not like to fail and we know when we have failed. We have a history of accepting leadership positions whether as professionals, volunteers, or students. We find great need for our services on our campuses and in our communities and find it difficult to turn our backs on those we may be able to help. People with those attributes have difficulty putting an end to the working day. Worse yet, we share life with another person who could be described in similar terms. Furthermore, that other person has a job which demands his best day and night, Sundays, holidays, and spring break. Doesn't it follow that you and he need your best at the same time? Giving your best may range from not flinching when a party doubles in size overnight to saying, "never fear, I will carry your greetings to the Alumni Club in Timbuktu while you go and negotiate the budget with the governor" to postponing an argument you were winning when the door bell rings announcing a group of students who have always wanted to see the president's house. It isn't possible to disentangle ourselves from his job at moments like these. Of course we want to give our best. We expect it of ourselves, and the community which alternately courts, ignores, and berates us expects better than our best from time to time. Is it any wonder we sometimes do not give ourselves or our jobs a rating of 10?

Some of our uncertainty could be overcome by recognition of our efforts and achievements. People who demand a lot of themselves look for ways to evaluate their accomplishments. We receive little outside assurance that we are doing a good job and sometimes suspect we could easily be replaced . . . by a robot . . . one who smiles and never forgets a name. Our assurances must come from inside ourselves—a source of confidence that is not endless but needs to be replenished from time to time by our husbands or wives, trustees, family, all of the people with whom we live and work. Because we are seen to be privileged, the community doesn't guess that we could use a little emotional nourishment on occasion.

I understand that a high percentage—37%—of the respondents in the AASCU survey have full-time positions in their own professions, but I do not have information regarding the amount of time they give to school activities. I suspect that they find it is not possible to separate themselves totally from the school for the same reasons the rest of us are entangled. I find it curious that at least half of these people began their paid careers after their husbands became president. I would like to know more about the change of conditions which enabled them or influenced them to take an outside job. All of the seven in my study had established themselves in their own profession long before their husbands became presidents.

I have encouraged wives, where possible, to accept the volunteer role I have described. We are a priceless asset to our schools. We can make an important contribution to the quality of life on campus because we bring a perspective and an intimate knowledge of the campus and its people which is unique, and because our husbands cannot do their best in the absence of our commitment to their goals and dreams. If couples and boards of trustees understood the conflict of emotions, which are triggered by their acceptance of each other, preliminary interviews with candidates would be more constructive. Following their acceptance of the position, wives must be prepared for the anguish of being dependent for friendship, warmth, and appreciation on a

man who doesn't have time to satisfy those needs and for the expectations of other people in her life to bear little resemblance to the expectations she has of herself. She may receive credit for things she has not done and little recognition for the things of which she is most proud. She will shoulder many unfamiliar and unwelcome family responsibilities. As funds available to our schools continue to decrease, we will be expected to close the widening gap between services available and services required with our own resources. Both husbands and wives will find themselves facing new demands on their time and energy and each will find that the balance of dependence and independence on which their relationship is based has shifted. The president will, of course, be equally dependent on his wife for friendship, honest appraisal, perspective, and companionship.

As you might expect, every woman I meet has a different view of her responsibilities, which depends on her personal desires and ambitions, her husband's spoken and unspoken expectations, her family's needs, the board's perceptions of her role, and school and community needs and attitudes. A few women deny any official responsibility and refuse any involvement in campus life. In my opinion, this attitude creates other problems for them. Their husbands are deeply involved in school activities and the wife's withdrawal means that each is living a separate and lonely existence, thus putting another kind of stress on the marriage. At the other extreme are women who take their jobs so seriously that they go to the office every day and are so visibly involved that some people wonder whether they are directing all of the presidents' decisions. Obviously, the ideal is somewhere in between and would be defined differently by each of us. None of us is free to define the job in the absence of the concerns of many other people. At the same time, no one else has the right to dictate what that job should include. In the past, our concerns have been overlooked by others in their concepts of our jobs. We need to be consulted when our job is being defined. Having arrived at a definition, we must be prepared to have our definition challenged. One's concept of one's job is a personal thing and to have it challenged is threatening and unsettling. If you were a teacher or a nurse, everyone would understand what that means and there would be standards against which you and others would measure your performance. The expectations and responsibilities of your position would be clear to you and to your superiors. We do not have the comfort of a clear definition. There is no basis for evaluating our performance. We do not have superiors. We cannot be fired and we cannot quit. We are left longing for an elusive social perfection which would make us the masters of every situation.

Now that I am out of the job, much wiser and much more relaxed, I know that the struggle for mastery, for understanding, for satisfaction was a painful one but one that left me with good feelings about myself, my accomplishments, and the way those years were spent. I didn't run away, though I often wanted to, and I saw women who did. I know now that although I didn't make many close personal friends, I helped make many friends for the university. I often felt inept but at my worst moments I was learning . . . about myself and about others. I was capable of much more than I thought and the knowledge that I overcame some difficulties is wonderful. Best of all my husband and I shared in an intense, demanding, rewarding period of our lives.

The book (The Partners: Sharing the Life of a College President) is full of advice from women who have differing attitudes. The only advice I have to give applies to

everyone here regardless of their sex, their talents, their beliefs. It is at the same time a warning. Be very sure of your priorities. What is it you really want? What would you like to carry away with you from this job? What kind of person do you hope to be ten years from now? In the long run, what is really important? If you can be honest with yourself in finding the answers to these questions and if your partner shares your concerns, you will be successful in making difficult choices and finding your way in the busy years ahead.

Your priorities will help you in defining your own concept of your jobs. Everyone who asks your participation in school related events has a different concept of your job. Sometimes they reveal their concept of your job by leaving you out of things you would be most interested in. More likely, someone will ask you to schedule a house tour for some worthy organization in the middle of your busiest season. You can say "no," and you should say "no" whenever necessary. Once the schedule gets out of hand, trying to regain control is like trying to stop a runaway truck. The community feels no sense of responsibility for the woman who ruins her health trying to please everyone and little affection for the one who wants only to please herself. A partner will work at finding a balance between her own needs and official obligations. Official duties aren't all that bad. Some are fun. Some are rewarding meetings and interesting students and guests. Some are tiresome and repetitious and exhausting. Sometimes official duties, which have been on the calendar for months and involve commitments to other people and groups, conflict with pressing family obligations, forcing us to make some difficult choices. At moments like that, official duties become an almost unbearable burden. These are the moments no one else can help us with and the public rarely hears about. There are times when the circumstances do not allow us a choice. Sometimes the school takes priority. There is a job to be done. It requires talent, brains, dedication, and a peculiar mix of love, understanding, and pride. We cannot be replaced. We are partners still! When it is all behind you, you will have the satisfaction of knowing that you gave your best effort to one of the most difficult, most challenging jobs in existence. We are given opportunities to serve our schools, our communities, ourselves. Personal development is inevitable. Be sure the changes in you are positive ones that you can live with in the future. Try to remember that you are entrusted with the personal and professional concerns of people you care about and that you are in a position to protect those concerns and enhance the quality of the job they do or make their lives miserable.

I would like to quote from a speech my husband gave recently at the investiture of his friend, Hugh Latimer, as President of West Virginia Wesleyan College. In it is to be found the motivation for wives or husbands who search for ways to be as supportive and helpful as possible to their presidential partners. "The presidential view of his or her institution is a picture of responsibility. A view of a fragile and significant resource to which his or her leadership skills—and indeed a segment of his or her life will be devoted and by which these skills will be tested."

We are so close to people with this awesome trust. Is it any wonder we share their sense of responsibility and choose to spend ourselves . . . our time, our energy, all of our resources on the attainment of shared goals and try to let them know that they can count on us? We are partners still!

THE DECISION TO LEAD

Dr. Mary Jean Pew
Former President of Immaculate Heart College, California
and Member of the Board of Trustees in California

I appreciate the invitation to speak before a group representing institutions that educate over 2½ million students a year. Yours is indeed an extremely challenging task and a formidable responsibility. Awarding over 40 percent of the baccalaureate degrees given nationally is a staggering figure; the collective impact of your institutions will be felt for generations to come, and will affect the future of this country in most substantive terms.

I stand before you with two perspectives: public and private. In the private sector of higher education I served as a professor of government, academic dean, and acting president at a small private college in Los Angeles. As a member of the California State University Board of Trustees, I was fortunate in having the nonprivate experience, which provided me with an impressive view of the public sector; this experience also gave me even greater respect for these institutions. Although there are many differences between the public and private sectors of higher education, there is one shared interest and concern to which I would like to address my remarks today.

As we look to the future of higher education in this country, there is a common reality—that of increasingly limited financial resources. Whether caused by less-than-expected tax support, inflation, decline in the number of traditional college age students, or any and all combinations of the above—having less money than we think necessary is the overriding, legitimate concern of all of us.

I was acting president for one year of a college that closed its doors, a college that had existed for sixty-four good, but always lean years. It did not close because it was not viable, nor because it did not have students; not because it lacked imagination or solid academic programs. It closed because it had accumulated indebtedness and a tired—albeit loyal—Board of Trustees. While many of us disagreed with the closure decision, the fact is that what was perceived as inadequate financial resources brought about closure. God forbid that any of you ever find yourselves in this extreme position—you, after all, have public, tax support; some of you have tuition income, and there is an increased push toward expanding solicitation of private dollar support for tax-supported institutions. It is fallacious to assume that budgetary difficulties are short-lived, and although you may not face imminent closure, you all face immediate, real, and most difficult decisions about where to spend, and not to spend money, and where to cut budgets. What I really want to say today to this collective leadership is this: do not let fiscal constraints reinforce trends that are becoming more and more evident in the world of higher education, trends that produce similarities rather than diversities. It is discouraging to review college catalogs and see so many in which you could substitute

the name of one college for another and not know the difference. If higher education does not provide diversity in curriculum, in values, in faculty, in the learning environment, if educational programs do not emphasize student responsibility, we are in real danger of turning out people whom we call educated, but who really have never had to think, to choose, to articulate values.

What seems to be happening, at least judging from public statements about fiscal restrictions, is that more time is spent in negative reaction than in setting a climate for creative, innovative ways to redesign educational programs. Spending less does not, ipso facto, mean education has less quality; in fact, it just might possibly improve the process.

With less money, a dominant concern surfaces, not unexpectedly,—that of protecting turf. Administrators, faculty, staff—all use elaborate educational jargon to justify what is in large part trying to guarantee a kind of fragile security. The great push to tighten general education requirements, is, at least in part, an attempt to guarantee faculty jobs, rather than quality education. There may be an argument for some minimal general education requirements, but when the rationale is largely a restatement of justifications from years ago, the cynic in me wonders about what part of the motivation is concern for the future of our society, and what part is job protection.

What happens all too often, in a budget-cutting environment, unless you as leaders counteract it, is a mentality of self-preservation, a model of rigidity, a 'don't rock the boat' mentality. If we do venture into experimental courses, into new avenues of inquiry, or, God help us, have a controversial speaker, the legislature may cut our already lean budgets, or this or that corporation may not endow the chair. Courageous leadership involves many delicate, complicated judgments and a shrewd sense of which battles to fight and which to bypass, abilities which were difficult enough in times of plenty. Scarcity compounds the difficulties, but at the same time makes it even more imperative that education leaders take risks and dare to change.

It is possible to have diverse, tax-supported institutions, where there is real pursuit of truth and an open learning environment, even when contrary political expectations and declining financial support seem to point in other directions. If this is not possible, maybe we should shut down all of higher education and let the corporations train their own technicians and the professional sports colossus expand its own training and recruiting program. While this latter comment is partly facetious, an underlying fear is that in this age of limited resources we will limit, rather than create, new, less expensive, and essentially better ways of doing what we must do, educate. We must avoid the pitfall of trying to do everything, a trap we fell into in the sixties; we must do what no other part of our society does, and do it excellently.

Sitting on the California State University Board of Trustees, overseeing the nation's largest public system of higher education, I saw continued discussion of quality being eroded by the latest requirements of budget-cutting. What I also saw was what much of the private sector would call luxury being called essential in the public sector. A small but symptomatic example—during one of our numerous conflicts with the governor over CSU budgetary needs, a faculty member's letter to the Los Angeles Times appeared, citing examples of the negative impact the reduction would have on the quality of teaching. The proof cited, as I recall, was that it would take more time to

have tests typed because there would be less staff support. There were other examples, all along the same lines. A faculty representative on the statewide senate wanted to be sure I had seen the letter because it demonstrated most substantively the negative impact of the budget cuts. I was appalled—if that was the best case that could be made, the governor was right; the system could survive with less. What the public sector is accustomed to looking on as essential may in fact be luxury; as budgets get leaner it is amazing what can become luxury.

I do not mean to minimize the difficult, painful, frustrating process involved in this redefinition, in budget cutting. Do you reduce faculty, and where? How can you reduce student personnel services without alienating the very individuals you exist to serve? Deferred maintenance can be very costly in the long run. Many would consider professional travel essential to an institution's reputation and a faculty member's growth in her/his discipline. Library holdings must continually be updated, and everyone knows what that costs. The list goes on and on; there is no easy, nor uniform, answer to any of these realities. I have nothing but heartfelt sympathy for Chancellor Dumke and the presidents of the 19 campuses in California as they comply with an executive order to cut $20 million out of the current operating budget. At the same time, the system must propose a budget for next year that reduces spending by 5 percent after allowing for inflation. Around the country, institutions facing similar situations are freezing hiring and stopping purchasing as they have just done in California. I am not unaware of the real test of administrative leadership this requires; but leadership that is creative and compassionate and innovative can respond in such a manner that integrity and diversity are fostered, not limited.

I would like to return to my private college experiences and share some of our accomplishments in the last lean years to illustrate that limited resources need not reduce, but may in fact stimulate, creativity. It was during the most difficult years at the college, in the early and mid-seventies that we saw the most substantive curricular redefinitions, a solid and, at that time, innovative program for adults returning to college, a highly respected bilingual teacher preparation program, new graduate programs in movement and art therapy, just to mention a few changes that we implemented in the seventies. These programs and changes came from a grossly underpaid faculty, a faculty with no travel money and minimal, at best, secretarial support, a faculty who were aware of the increasingly tight budget situation but who succeeded admirably in identifying what was essential to quality and what was luxury. And, what still surprises me, is that in our last year, after the decision to close was made, excellent teaching continued to exist. In all of the faculty worry about future employment, academic programs and commitments to the students were fulfilled.

So, to those of you whose institutions still exist, I urge you to be different; I urge you to spend the funds you do have in such a way that your institutions are better with less. Exercise the kind of administrative creativity that gives heart to your faculties and makes the learning experience unsettling for the students, so that they are somewhat prepared to face a future which, God knows, is at best unsettling. Make the lean years good years, and these may well be the best of times for higher education. That is leadership at its finest; no less is required.

AN OVERVIEW OF BRAZIL'S DEVELOPMENT AND U.S. BRAZILIAN RELATIONS

Antonio F. Azeredo da Silveira
Ambassador of Brazil to the U.S.

In the different positions I have held during my career, I have always believed in the need for a constructive participation of educators in the various domains of national life, especially in the area of foreign affairs. Having dealt all my adult life with international questions, I think I can duly testify to the remarkable contribution of the academic community in the field of foreign relations. In this respect, I was particularly touched by the manifestations of support I got from many Brazilian educators during my tenure as Minister of Foreign Affairs—a period in which many necessary adjustments were made in the Brazilian foreign policy, in response to the extraordinary changes that had taken place in Brazil in all aspects of our national life. The role Brazilian educators played—and still play—in the task of debating and explaining to a large segment of our population the evolution of Brazilian foreign policy is absolutely remarkable, especially when viewed in the light of the many social, political, and cultural changes that had occurred within the country. Today I can only pay homage to this challenging and irreplaceable stimulus.

It is not my intention to give you a propaganda lecture on my country nor to run the risk of boring you with statistics or other official platitudes. I have thus chosen to share with you some general reflections on the international situation and how now Brazil and the United States—to my view—fit, or might fit, in this context of events. I will then conclude with a short overview of Brazil-U.S. relations.

When we look at the state of international relations today, we are forced to admit that along the east-west and North-South axis, as well as within each of these areas, the international panorama reflects a noticeable interplay of pressures and counter-pressures. Relations between the superpowers have become more tense and the balance of power has, most unfortunately, been determined by the nuclear arsenals that each one is accumulating. What is also astonishing is the fact that these nuclear weapons, contrary to historical experience with conventional armaments, have preempted the superpowers ability to assert their political and economic power. The efforts at disarmament, of which nuclear disarmament is the key, have not yet yielded any substantial results. The arms race remains unabated as the great powers continue to increase their spheres of influence all over the world and we see a proliferation of regional conflicts as well as a dangerous tendency towards the internationalization of these conflicts. The cold war has become riskier and more complex. Therefore today we must realize the uncertainties that characterize the world situation.

There is no place today for automatic alignments outside the socialist world. Equity, mutual respect, and fair partnership have become increasingly more important ingre-

dients in international affairs and constitute the only realistic basis for strong and stable relationships between nations. As consultation must increase for the benefit of all interested parties, so there must be a growing recognition of the diversity that characterizes today's world. This requires that all have the right to agree or disagree on a basis of frankness and self-respect.

This diversity—which encompasses such key factors as national interests and aspirations, different geographic areas and stages of development, among many other things—determines the fact that countries play a different role in the world. It is thus not realistic to expect uniformity in the roles played by the various protagonists of international affairs. Dialogue and understanding luckily increase the areas of agreement but should not be conceived in terms of requiring attitudes of automatic alignment and one-way bloc solidarity.

The Western World is no longer a geographic or even a cultural concept in traditional terms. It is rather an economic universe and a form of cooperation between unequals, in weight and direct motivation. Although this fact presents a serious challenge, I see it as a factor of strength, which demands our best and most creative efforts.

Brazil is simultaneously a part of the west and of the Third Word. We share the values of the West, among which are the respect for the values of freedom, equality, and pluralism. We realize, however, that it is not possible or reasonable to simplify the problem of making the West a single unit, whether on a national or international basis.

The links between Brazil and the developing countries have grown at an impressive rate in recent years. Over the last decade, trade between Brazil and the developing world expanded by 1,700 percent. Last year alone 44 percent of Brazil's global trade was conducted with the third world.

I had the opportunity of addressing the subject of the plurality of dimensions of Brazil in a speech, when I turned over the office of Minister of Foreign Affairs of Brazil to Ambassador Ramiro Guerreiro. At that time, I said: "Our country is inevitably complex and is characterized by a plurality of dimensions. With a Portuguese background—and all that this implies—Brazil belongs at the same time to the west and to the Third World. Brazil carries fundamental influence in the region where it is located. It has remarkable ethnic diversity and harmony disttinguishes her internal life, and this apparent contradiction stimulates Brazil to an active and diversified participation in world affairs. It is part of the Latin American and American communities, it is largely European and it has African roots as well, which opens up a wide range of opportunities for foreign relationship."

Another concept I would like to share with you is that of bilateralism. We must never forget the importance of the bilateral relation which so many times serves as a foundation and reinforces the global approaches. Thus, bilateralism must be taken into some consideration even when dealing with global international approaches. Otherwise, efforts for common actions may tend to annul themselves very quickly if they do not include the general motivations, ideals and goals of the countries involved.

Let me try to make now, a brief overview of Brazil-U.S. relations.

Although the United States was the first country to recognize Brazil's independence, proclaimed in 1822, bilateral relations were somehow intriguing and remained somewhat aloof during most of the nineteenth century. The basic reason was that there was

a certain difficulty for the government of the United States to understand the existence of an empire—with a democratic constitution it is true—in the overwhelmingly republican-oriented governments in this hemisphere. The proclamation of the republic in 1889 brought a new phase in the relations between Brazil and the United States. Besides the change of regime, which was already a factor which by itself enhanced bilateral relations, the strengthening of the Brazilian-U.S. relationship was largely due to the work of a famous Brazilian politician and a remarkable diplomat, Rio Branco, whose tenure as Minister of Foreign Affairs lasted for over 10 years under three different presidents. Washington was chosen as the seat of the first Brazilian Embassy abroad, at a time when there were in the American capital very few embassies and only one (Mexico) from a Latin American country. The following decades showed a growing relationship, encompassing not only trade, but also—and in an increasingly important way—political cooperation. As a consequence, American investments and interests quickly grew in Brazil.

Bilateral relations were considerably strengthened during World Wars I and II, when Brazil fought side by side with the Americans in Europe. I don't think many people realize the extent of the sacrifice imposed on a country with limited resources and equipment. This participation cost the lives of many Brazilians, who demonstrated in the most concrete way Brazil's attachment to the noblest values of the West, which were then being threatened: freedom, right of nonintervention, condemnation of the use of force, etc.

The decade of the seventies introduced a new scenario in the bilateral relationship. Brazil succeeded in overcoming many obstacles and made many strides on the road to progress. The rates of economic growth were spectacular and this performance gave birth to the expression "Brazilian Miracle." The Brazilian gross national product grew from $81 billion in 1973 to $255 billion in 1980. Global foreign trade increased from $12 billion in 1973 to $42 billion in 1980 and in the present year will rise to about $52 billion. A new and far more developed industrial structure emerged in the country and Brazil had to turn itself more and more to foreign markets to sell its products—by now mainly manufactured goods in contrast to the commodities trade of the previous decades—and to acquire the necessary imports and supplies for its development, becoming, thus, a far more sophisticated and complex partner in the international areas.

With all our financial problems as a non-oil-producing country, Brazil ranks today as the 9th western and the 10th world economy. It is the second biggest world producer of agricultural commodities, the main steel manufacturer among the developing countries and the third most important country in shipbuilding.

All these changes have had their impact on bilateral relations with the United States. In face of Brazil's development it was only natural that interaction between our two countries had to become—as they indeed have become—more complex, in different levels. There was then an urgent need for new mechanisms to upgrade the bilateral dialogue. The answer came with a balanced document which has been playing a very important and positive role in bilateral Brazil-U.S. relations. I refer to the memorandum of understanding, which I had the privilege of signing, in February 1976, as Brazilian Minister of Foreign Affairs, with former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. The memorandum of understanding has provided a suitable framework within which we

can frankly discuss our positions. Under the umbrella of the memorandum, a certain number of working subgroups were created to deal with bilateral cooperation in specific subjects, such as trade, agriculture, energy technology, etc. Moreover, the memorandum of understanding has provided the adequate channels for a political dialogue—our foreign planning staffs meet regularly every year—which is mature, and comprehensive today. This mechanism was also very useful in providing the framework for the conversations which took place even during the short period of strained bilateral relations, three years ago. These short-term difficulties, so artificially created and for which we, Brazilians, bear no responsibility, have fortunately been overcome.

Since then, contacts between our two countries are intense and an extremely vast network of interests exists in many areas. Today Brazil and the United States have a total trade of more than $8 billion per year, which is particularly important when we realize that oil is not included. The business, academic, sports, cultural, and other area of our relations seem to follow their own dynamics. What is important to bear in mind is that problems in one sector should not necessarily spill over to others, while progress in certain areas should definitely stimulate activities and relationships in others. I believe this is the proper attitude for Brazilians and Americans to take. Therefore, we should be increasingly prepared to operate on the several levels of our bilateral relationship. Since my arrival in this country, a little over two years ago, I have been able to participate in many discussions aimed at the solution of specific problems. Results achieved have strongly reinforced my confidence in the aptitude of Brazilians and Americans for solving their problems in a constructive atmosphere and for creating new stimuli to the strengthening of our bilateral relationship.

I am very happy to be able to share with you my optimistic view about the realities and possibilities of cooperation between Brazil and the United States. Both countries have adjusted themselves to the functional and organic changes that occurred in their bilateral relations and in the world as a whole. We have been increasing the level of consultations, and contacts are growing in frequency and importance. In this context, the visit of Vice President Bush to Brazil as well as the two meetings held this year between the Brazilian Minister of Foreign Affairs and the U.S. Secretary of State are recent highlights which concretely demonstrate the extent and usefulness of these contacts. The invitation now extended by President Reagan to President Figueiredo to pay a state visit to the United States completes this scenario for increasingly important contacts and dialogue. So let us congratulate ourselves on that. Let us also hope for the best to our children and grandchildren. It is going to depend a lot on education.

FEDERAL RELATIONS IN A CHANGED ENVIRONMENT

E. K. Fretwell Jr., Moderator
Chancellor
The University of North Carolina at Charlotte

President Ronald Williams, Northeastern Illinois University[1]

I must say though that there was a willingness to listen [in reference to a meeting with representatives of the Reagan Administration]. I think the absence of a policy in this particular instance is peculiar to a number of areas where a long-range objective has been launched, but what is not clear is how you get there and what are the consequences of doing certain things. I think (and this is strictly my inference) that the Reagan Administration's strategy in cutting the budget in domestic areas is to go across-the-board to cut as heavily as possible until there is political resistence; where there is political resistance, they give in a bit, but continue cutting. Higher education does not seem to be favorite in any way. In fact, there isn't really a sensitivity to what higher education is all about. The only thing I come away from that meeting with that bordered on optimism was their willingness to listen. These people are going to be in the White House for four years, and we are going to have to talk to them. We are going to have to explain ourselves over and over again. The second aspect "What Limitation of Block Grants on the State Level" has not been thought out by the persons we talked to at the White House; for example, suppose x number of dollars were given to a particular state in a given area; is the state required to use the monies in that area? If the state is hard pressed, could it use it for welfare? Well, that had not been thought through as it were. So, the fate of higher education, as currently evaluated by the persons with whom we had contact, is still very much in the air.

Now, it seems to me that we have an alternative facing us unlike any we have faced in the past. We can become the desk managers in the history of higher education, especially on the decline and fall of institutions. That is, planning how to cut budgets and wringing our hands and going under in good accounting style of which even our legislators can be proud.

But, I would like to think of myself, and you think of yourselves, as educational leaders, which means that we have an obligation. AASCU institutions especially have an obligation because we educate a certain segment of the population who look to us as perhaps that last avenue for economic mobility. We have the obligation to start explaining what we do and selling ourselves to all of our publics; our alumni, business, industry,

[1] Editor's Note: The transcription of this session began after President Williams' speech was already in progress.

and students. What is at stake is whether or not we are still going to provide that opportunity for mobility, that opportunity for getting on in this society as we have in the past. I think we are going to have to make our case—well, I am taking a stand. AASCU institutions are going to have to make their case as AASCU institutions. If we tried to get a watered down case (as we have on many issues), we lose what is unique about us. The large prestigious institutions, land-grant institutions are going to be making theirs for them, and the compromises, if compromises are to be made, will certainly not be made to our advantage.

Now how can some of this be done? I received a document, done at Cleveland State University, which spells out graphically and explicitly how important Cleveland State University is to its community, in terms of the amount of money generated, number of jobs generated, what is expected of persons who graduate and go into the economy, how many dollars they generate. We are going to have to start seeing ourselves as a very important industry in the community and we are going to have to document the contribution to that community. I think that the job done at Cleveland State is a very fine one, and it can serve if not as a model, certainly as a suggestion for some of us.

We are also going to have to talk about the importance of our universities, about the future recovery of this country. And we are going to have to talk about the importance of educating young people for social stability as well as economic stability. If I had a choice between a balanced budget and social chaos, I would certainly rather sleep well and have an imbalanced budget. I do not think the alternatives are quite that opposed, but, we are going to have to talk about what the consequences are if we no longer serve the role that we do in our society. In short, I think that we are going to have to raise the vision of America and see what the possibilities are within this country that can be achieved or at least assisted through our universities. We are going to have to raise the clarion pride throughout the land so that we can receive the support that we need to do our job, even if we have to do it modestly. Because if we don't, if we do not articulate a particular mission and a particular charge for ourselves, no one else will.

President John C. Wright, University of Alabama in Huntsville

I would like to reiterate some of the things that were said: First, we are a vital part of the world and since it is the only world we've got, we had better learn to work with it, including the administration that is going to be here for awhile. When I went to work as a chemist for the state board of regents, I had a chance to look at higher education in different ways than I had on campus, and I came to see that we had planned programs primarily from a production model: This is what we can produce; you come and get it. I think we are going to have to look at it more from a marketing model: What is it that you need out there? How can we help you? We are going to have to become more active and less passive.

Second, the university is a vital part of its community, a vital part of its region. The University of Alabama in Huntsville is a vital part of that area, especially because we are a high technology cluster. We also were created when that region became a high technology area as a result of the government's activities at the Marshalls States' Right Center. Third, the university president has an obligation to be a part of the leadership

of his community, and this is where I think my views might differ a little bit from some of the things that are indicated here, that is, I don't think we work alone. I think we mobilize the community that we work with to accomplish what is good for that community.

Fourth, as a part of the leadership, we must be able to understand federal policy. That is an obligation of a president and, increasingly, I have come to realize that my academic vice president is going to have to be more active on campus in the coming years and I am going to be more active in external relationships. We have a development office that is composed of alumni, annual fund drives, institutional data, news and publications, special projects, and government relations. We have a person whose job is government relations and that gets very close to lobbying. I would agree that one needs to know one's county politicians, city politicians, state politicians, as well as federal. But because we are primarily a commuter campus, we concentrate at the federal level on two congressmen. One in our district, and the other in a nearby district where there is no university. He is also on the Appropriations Committee and Chairman of the Energy Subcommittee on Appropriations, so he is worth working on.

We work with both senators and our community because we have three major federal activities: the Marshalls States' Rights Center, with an annual flow-through budget of $1.3 billion; the Missile Command, with an annual budget of about $4 billion; and the Ballistics Missile Defense Command, with an annual budget of $1.3 billion. Now, to be specific about what this means to us; our analysis of the federal policy suggests—and, this is where we are unique—that as federal assistance decreases our enrollments are going to increase. Our student body has the highest ACT scores in the state, comparable to private institutions and very technically oriented we foresee that those students are going to stay at home, and other students are going to come to that town because they can get jobs, either in a co-op program or another program. So we expect the federal policy to result in a net increase in enrollment at our particular institution. We have alerted our faculty that the money is going to be flowing through the defense areas so they know where to go for research. We are currently operating at about $4 million per year in research and we expect that to double within the next few years, primarily because of defense-related research efforts.

President Rodney H. Brady, Weber State College, Utah

I am going to take a somewhat risky approach and try to challenge you by asking you to pretend that I am not a college president, but rather a federal executive or even a member of one of your governing boards. I would like to provide some honest advice. First of all, as we examine the subject of the federal government and institution relationships, I think we need to ask ourselves why we want to have these relationships. I believe there are two quite obvious reasons. First, we each want to stay up-to-date on what is happening in Washington. We want to know the issues that are being debated, the legislation that is being considered, so that we can appropriately accommodate them in our institutional settings if they are passed and become law. Most of us, however, as we think of maintaining relationships in Washington think in terms of how we can somehow influence what is happening there. Can we have an impact on the policies and the legislation?

Well, visualize yourself sitting there at the big desk, surrounded by the large staff; through your office you have marching 10 to 20 individuals or groups of individuals every day, each with their own special interest to plead, and at the end of the day you have some decisions to make. Which of those visitors or which of the mail that you receive is going to have an impact on the decisions you make or the recommendations you issue. We had at this session, two fine federal officials. Both are very competent in their field. I question whether by the way we treated those individuals today we are going to have a substantial impact on the decisions they make and the way they think about educational issues. I don't think that rhetoric like "you were strangling me last year, and this year you are going to cut my throat," is the kind of thing that will cause me (as a federal official) necessarily to act any differently than I had already planned to act. I believe we need to develop methods of selling our positions in a far more effective way than that.

May I make just six suggestions that might be helpful and close at that point. First, I believe that we need to provide some creative, positive, helpful ideas to the federal officials, congressmen, and senators that will help them in their decision-making. They are under all kinds of pressure from above, beside, and below; but one of the greatest pressures that they have is the pressure for good, sound, solid ideas. They are being asked all the time for their ideas, and if we can offer them creative, positive ideas, I believe we can be helpful in formulating public policy.

Second, I believe it is important to show respect for those in positions of responsibility. If someone comes into your office and immediately treats you as a person who is incompetent and lacking in wisdom, how receptive are you going to be to that person? Not very receptive. But, if someone comes in and shows respect for you as a person and for the office that you hold, I believe you are more likely to listen and receive what is provided to you. People are more apt to listen to and help friends than those who are perceived as enemies. Third, officials, congressmen, senators, but particularly people in the executive branch, are far more likely to listen to a person who does not have an obvious special interest or ax to grind. Therefore, if we as presidents can use those people in our communities and states who are not directly associated with higher education but who we know will support higher education and have them plead our case, present our ideas, make our proposals, they will be viewed far more objectively than if those of us with special interests make those proposals. You might consider using your governing boards more effectively to do this. Rely on your governing boards not only to act in the role of governing you but also to help the institution accomplish its goals. I think they can be used very effectively in that light.

Fourth, I think we need to continue our efforts with our colleagues within our respective states to develop unified positions within our state first and then meet with our elected congressmen and representatives. If we gather together our colleagues and college presidents, as well as others on our campuses, substantial political clout can be exhibited; and I believe that a unified effort state-by-state can have much more effect than if each institution tried to deal on its own. Fifth, I think it is very important that we continue to work as a body through AASCU and our other nationwide higher education associations to develop a unified position and have them help to carry the messages. Though, as far as the Congress is concerned, I believe, they are going to be

listening much more closely to the representatives from the respective states and districts than from some national association.

The final point I would like to make is that timing is essential when we need to address an important issue. It is vital that we address it before public officials have taken public positions on that issue. It is very difficult for a public official to reverse himself or herself once that position has been made public. So timing is of the essence. Let us make sure that we get out ahead of the issues rather than tagging along behind.

Chancellor E. K. Fretwell Jr., The University of North Carolina at Charlotte

We will move into the third and concluding part of this session, which is opportunities for members of the audience to speak either to state a position or to ask a question. It does not have to be a question; here is your chance to say what you have been wanting to say, provided that you do not make a long, long speech of it. I would like to introduce first, John Mallan, of the Office of Governmental Relations of AASCU.

John Mallan, Vice President for Governmental Relations, AASCU

I would like to make several points. First, it is often a good idea to have people other than the president who can contact Congress—trustees, who may be very influential people; sometimes other members of your faculty or staff, who may know congressmen or have worked in their campaigns; and especially students and parents.

Second, one should always become familiar with congressional staff members, both in the congressman's office and in the district. You can almost always reach them, and they may have more knowledge of the issues which concern you—for example, every congressman has someone who at least theoretically follows education issues.

Third, it is very important to invite congressmen and senators to visit the college, to meet faculty and students, to speak during campaigns. This is also a way of helping give them local publicity.

It is also important to encourage newly elected people to ask for committee assignments that can be helpful—not only education, but especially budget and appropriations.

Chancellor E. K. Fretwell Jr.

Good point. I would comment very briefly here on an AASCU paper, entitled "Working with your Congressman and Senators." It suggests that AASCU presidents designate a federal liaison representative on their campuses. How many people have such a representative right now? Can you name the person you just thought about when you put your hand up? Do you see that person fairly often? It seems to me that this individual needs to be right on top of what is going on in the Congress, in the executive departments, through the AASCU office, through other devices, even when you as president or chancellor are out doing other kinds of good work. In other words, legislation-watching is just about a full-time job, even though this person may be asked by you to do something else. I would hope that that person, would have his/her own network with other people in the system in the central office on other campuses and know who the people are who have sharp eyes and ears in terms of what is going on so that you can follow-up one of the excellent suggestions that Rodney made of working

together with other people in your state, in your system, as well as where it appears appropriate on a national basis.

President Reatha Clark King, Metropolitan State University, Minnesota

To Rodney, what is wrong with being self-serving? Isn't it irresponsible not to be?

President Rodney Brady

Oh, I think it is fine to be self-serving. Each one of us is self-serving, but I am talking about being effective in selling a position or a product. Now, anyone who has ever been involved in selling a product will know that it is important that the salesman not appear to be self-serving, but rather appear to be speaking in the interest of the particular customer. Usually, it is easier to do if you do not have painted across your apparel, "I am a university president, I have a particular position and this position definitely benefits my institution." That has to be done, believe me, but the most effective salesmanship is going to come through some of the particular people that John here has just mentioned—those people to whom congressmen and senators listen. If we can talk to them and, in turn, have them talk to the senators and representatives, I think we can get a lot further. That is my only point, I certainly believe that every one of us is self-serving in some sense.

President Alice Chandler, State University College at New Paltz, New York

We have been talking a lot about the immediate impact of the federal budget cuts, but I wonder if we could pause to look at some of the larger issues. I was quite frankly shocked this morning to hear statements from our guests that an income level of $12,000–$15,000 was nonetheless sufficient to support students at public institutions. I do not know in what section of the country that is true, certainly not in the Northeast. It does seem to me that we are seeing in some of the statements that are coming out on Pell Grants and other forms of federal aid, that the so-called safety net is not working and that we are cutting back on opportunity. Look at where some of the cuts have been made. For example, in the National Science Foundation they have been made in programs designed to increase access. There are programs to bring minorities or women into science education. What we are seeing here (and it is not incongruent with other aspects of current federal policy) does seem to me to be a cutting of access.

I guess the question I would ask is what can we do to counter this thrust, which I think most of us find to be outside our philosophical position. I think that something President Williams said earlier is worth considering, "that each of us know for our own campus what the conomic impact of the institution is, and what we are actually doing in the way of graduating students who become members of a productive labor force, taxpayers, people who are in the more advanced sections of our economy.

I suppose it is an impossible dream, but I do wonder if AASCU might coordinate a series of questionnaires among all institutions leading to a profile of what happens when you offer educational opportunity to people who previously would not have been able to enter the educational segment. I think a lot of the attacks that have come on higher education have come from people who think that nothing happened; I think that the answer that most of us would present is that we in the state colleges and univer-

sities know otherwise. So, I am not quite sure to whom I have addressed this question. Perhaps it is in the nature of a statement, but I think it is a point we should consider.

President Ronald Williams

One hardly knows what to say when one agrees. Clearly, I think that that $12,000–$15,000 family is having a very difficult time sending children to school, and when you have a decline in grants, so that there is less money for grants, formulas being changed, and the job market constricting where there are not part-time jobs, I think that these families feel the brunt of it first. At least, this seems to be what is happening at our university. I certainly do agree. I think that again, it is a question of working with alumni, with the people in the business community, and others to make this case as well as making it to the appropriate politician who understand what is happening in their community.

Chancellor E. K. Fretwell Jr.

In terms of what AASCU can do, I am going to call on John Mallan to follow-up on the suggestion that was just made.

John Mallan, AASCU

I think that Alice Chandler's comments are important, and I think Ed Elmendorf might be called on next. One effect of the cuts recommended by the administration on the Pell Grant program would be either to limit grants to people whose family incomes are under about $15,700, or to give very small grants to people above that level. Now the Senate hasn't voted as low a figure as the administration requested, and we are not out of the woods yet. We don't know if the president may veto or if there will be a continuing resolution with lower support levels for Pell and other programs.

In general, if student aid is restricted to incomes below $16,000 or even lower, there will be very serious problems of access. I really would like to hear from Ed on this.

Ed Elmendorf, Department of Education

Do I have a choice? There is a misstatement there. For the first time in offering legislation, the Department of Education gave Congress some alternatives and I think that is important for you to know. If you go back and compare what is in the Federal Register in terms of what we proposed to Congress, there will be a vast difference from what you have seen before. We said that we would protect low income students, and we put that up front as a rational statement of our purpose in that program. We identified low income students as being those from families earning $15,000 and below. We offered discretionary rates based on that protection, but we also offered five legislative options. If adopted those options would save sufficient money to allow that eligibility figure to climb to $27,000. Now, I do not believe that the administration feels that it has the power to make law, but it certainly has the responsibility to make suggestions for better law. We can change that eligibility figure giving the lower number and bring it up to $27,000, making more eligible, an opportunity for access and other kinds of avenues. The question that no one seems to be able to answer, and we cannot either, is what happens when those people over $15,000 or $27,000 lose their eligibility to

Pell Grants and cannot find sufficient campus-based funds. The choice they have right now is the Guaranteed Student Loan (GSL) Program. So, I am saying that we need to keep as many doors of opportunity open as possible; the Pell Grant program is but one. It is the most subsidized program—although I question whether or not GSL isn't just as subsidized, giving what we are paying to keep that program going. So you have to think more in terms of the combination of programs, rather than just one as bringing about access.

President Glenwood L. Creech, Florida Atlantic University

This is the second time in eight and a-half years that I have spoken publicly at an AASCU meeting. I have listened to this session and I am very distressed as a citizen. It is obvious that our country is in terrible financial straits. Anybody who has any intelligence knows that we are in deep trouble. The thing that I cannot understand is why highly educated people think higher education should not share in the cuts that are required to save this country's economy.

All I hear among my friends is "How do we tell them? How do we convince them that we need more money? Aren't we concerned about saving this country as well as getting more money for institutions? It is my own belief, and I know no one would agree with me, that at my own institution at least 20 to 30 percent of the students should not even be there. They are not equipped by motivation or ability to do the university work. I believe what Dr. Pew said an hour ago, "that much of what we are saying is essential is pure luxury," and I am getting rather disgusted with my friends because as educated people they will not stand up and say "we are ready to take our share of the sacrifice to save our country." I do not know what is wrong with us; we expect other people to make the sacrifice.

I happen to be a dairyfarmer also, a very large dairyfarm in Kentucky. I was very proud of my association when after learning that the administration was going to cut dairy price supports (which meant $10,000 a year out of my retirement income) our association decided that in the interest in preserving this country, we should not oppose it. Now, I have come to another AASCU meeting, and all I hear about is strategy on how to get more or keep what we have at a time when we must endure some cuts; so I would like to ask this panel, why aren't we considering taking our share of those cuts and still doing as Dr. Pew says is possible, "teaching excellently in a period of recession?" Would you please answer that for me?

President Rodney Brady

I guess I would answer President Creech the same way as Ron Williams just answered our question over here. I would yes, and amen. I happen to believe that the points you have made are very important, and points that we all need to consider very seriously. As I mentioned yesterday in a meeting, we all have to look internally at ways whereby we can provide more and better with less. We need to look at the productivity of our institutions and ask ourselves if we can handle the job more efficiently and more effectively than we have in the past. I believe there continues to be opportunity for us to do that, and I believe we do need to take our cuts with the rest.

President Donald E. Walker, Southeastern Massachusetts University

I think the comments that have been made are sincerely given and I think it is that kind of candor we need at our meetings. But, I think we are confusing causes and results. Most of us in this room, if we belong to state systems, have already gotten the ground glass enema. We gave at the office. Furthermore, when we talk about higher education as if it is just another kind of service, we are confusing causes and results.

The Russians know who will command the future. It is the people who are trained and educated. They are at the moment putting more of the gross national product into education than we are. Now, we are so far ahead it would take them years to overtake; but, thinking that we can continue to cut higher education in this country is comparable to eating our seed corn. There is no way that a nation as complex as our own can hope to keep us and hold its place in the family of nations and in the power balance of the world unless our people are trained. You know people say that "Great Britain is going down the tubes because of the welfare state." There is another reason for that decline we might consider, that is, right now in Great Britain they have so reduced access to public higher education that only 7 percent of young people go on to any form of advanced training. That means that what you do, your children will do, and theirs in turn will do. When you have the class lines hardening and vertical mobility slowing up you destroy essence of the American dream.

President Reatha Clark King[2]

You have to be very careful about making a judgment about who should be in college. The taxpayer will say everytime those students should be in there, that is what they are paying for, but we, as presidents, must when we see such situations develop, use our creativity and work with the local school system to help deal with the people who in our judgment should not be there. I think we, as leaders, have the responsibility now to find solutions with public situations as President Wright mentioned, to connect with other sectors and work for solutions to the problem we observed. Those people should be somewhere, in some educational system, but why not propose some kind of relationship with the secondary level so that the problem is solved over time.

President Rodney Brady

Just a brief note in that regard. Do you know what is the best kept secret in the country is? It's a study that was done about the open admissions policy at CUNY but reported in the Harvard Education Review. What the study indicated (from my reading of it) was that it worked. It was not picked up by the New York Times, The Washington Post, Time Magazine, or Newsweek. It showed a number of things: that it did not increase the number of minorities, that it increased the number of whites who entered under the open admissions policy, that the intellectual level and standards did not drop, and that students were given a solid education and did move through. Interestingly enough, that was never made public, never disseminated or picked up as a hot item

[2] Reversing the tape recording caused a gap in transcription. Dr. King's comments are already in progress.

on the news wire. Clearly, we can educate anyone we want to educate if we want to educate them. Case in point: In 1918 the Russians knocked out its middle class and its professional class, took a bunch of serfs, and are putting people on the moon the way we are. The point is, if you are interested in educating people you educate them, if you don't, you have good reasons for not doing so.

President King's statement made me think of something additional that I would like to say. I was very surprised earlier today to learn that of the kind of facilities her campus had. Basically, no facilities. Yet many of us are living on campuses with beautiful buildings and continuing to build more. In some cases they are utilized half the time, two-thirds the time. We have tremendous investments there that are not really being fully utilized. If you invest a lot buying a computer, how many hours a day do you use that computer? Twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week; yet we put many times that much into our facilities and oftentimes we use them only five days a week, six, seven, eight hours a day if we are lucky. We have got to find ways of providing open enrollment, access to everyone, but at a lower cost, and we have got to use our imaginations to determine ways of doing that.

Chancellor E. K. Fretwell Jr.

Our rubric originally was "Federal Relations in a Changed Environment" but it seems to me that we have turned to such very basic questions as "What are the purposes of higher education? What are the roles of various sources of support? What is the nature of program(s)? How important are buildings and other facilities? What kind of stewardship are we providing in those facilities which we do have available to us?" In a sense, this panel has been a measurable failure; we have not answered all of your questions; we have not told you how to have perfect relations with the federal scene; we think, however, we may have stimulated you a little bit, and if you think so, please join me in thanking the panel that is sitting here and the panel that is sitting in the audience.

PRESENTATION FOR THE G. THEODORE MITAU AWARD FOR 1981

Dr. Glenn S. Dumke
Chancellor
California State University

I am honored to be asked to make the presentation for the G. Theodore Mitau Award for 1981. It was my privilege to know Ted Mitau personally and to have many contacts with him during the years of his chancellorship of the Minnesota State University system. As it turned out, we were facing much the same set of problems. He was busily developing a group of state colleges into a state university, as was I, and he was also facing the oncoming of collective bargaining, budget constraints, fluctuations of the business cycle, and other troublesome events, in addition to the final phases of the campus revolution—which was of course a nationwide phenomenon.

I am sure most of you know Ted's contribution to innovation and change leading to academic excellence. He helped to found Metropolitan State University, which has nationally exemplified the nontraditional approach. He was one of the people responsible for the establishment of The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education and served on its Board of Directors.

As a result of these contributions, the award is well named. Ted Mitau was one of the great leaders of American higher education during the last two decades. His leadership was marked by pioneering efforts to confront new challenges.

There are six categories which a college or university must consider when preparing a nomination for the Mitau Award:

- Increasing Access for Students
- Improvement of the Curriculum
- Teaching and Learning
- Faculty and Administrative Development
- Finance and Management
- Public Service

I intend to be presumptuous enough to suggest some additional areas of innovation and change which might fit within these six categories, which might win future awards for other institutions.

- With regard to Student Access, some college might win the Mitau Award by producing a study on the best ways to maintain academic standards in the face of pressures from enrollment-driven budgets and still guarantee access to new, less privileged clienteles. If we want to be really unfair to our students, we will lessen the academic demand for those who are less well prepared. Ways must be found to

ready them for our programs and to enable them to participate on the same basis as those more fortunate students who have come from better secondary backgrounds.

Another possible project having to do with student access might explore the appropriate balance between taxpayer responsibility and the responsibility of the individual student and other nonpublic sources in connection with the financing of public institutions. I know this is a difficult, complex, and often repugnant subject, but we in California are having to face it and I know that many others across the land are echoing our experience.

- With regard to Curriculum, perhaps some college or university in its hope for the Mitau Award will figure out a way to maintain the existence of Philosophy and Classics departments when enrollment shifts rapidly to vocational programs, and, on the other hand, when the cycle changes, may well develop ways and means of maintaining practical, applied, and occupational programs when, as happened in the sixties, the surge was all in the direction of social science. When a governor says to a president or chancellor, as governors have said to me—"Teachers aren't getting jobs—Close up your teacher education department!" or "Engineers are walking the streets. Fire your engineering faculty!"—there must be a sound answer based on reasoning which as yet has not been well defined by our profession. The basic integrity of a college or university program and its insistence on high standards must be maintained—whatever the current pressures of demography or budget.

- With regard to Teaching, all of us have, I think, experienced the willingness of legislators to speak highly of its importance, but then to turn around and give researchers higher salaries. This, I admit, has been a problem chiefly since Sputnik, but, after all, that's long enough. Somewhere along the line, the passing on of the wisdom of the ages to oncoming generations, which will enable civilization to stop reinventing the wheel every few years, must be given the public recognition and equivalent fiscal support to that which is currently bestowed upon research.

  Perhaps one of the reasons why teaching is not yet given its due is that teachers at any level have not yet learned how to evaluate their activity effectively. It's much easier to count publications, to recognize advancements in science and medicine, than it is to judge the effectiveness of a great teacher. Yet, in my opinion, no greater contribution could be made to higher education than to have this evaluation process refined and developed to the point where it could be understood and become of practical value to our profession. Maybe some future aspirant to the Mitau Award will look upon that innovation with favor.

- Faculty and Administrative Development involves many things: How to make a faculty more flexible so that as demand surges and declines in certain fields we do not have always to resort to termination but rather can retrain our able people to new skills in related areas. In terms of administration, the big job is to make managers out of teachers. Sometimes this can be done, sometimes it cannot. There ought

to be better ways of recognizing both possibilities. There is a wide open field for proposals and experiments in these important areas.

- The big problem in Finance is, as I see it, as our budgets grow to astronomical size, how to keep government from moving in to control higher education. This is happening all over the country. According to reports, some thirty-seven states now have quality control agencies in their governments as a result of a recent recommendation of the Education Commission of the States. These will quickly replace the voluntary accreditation process with government licensure unless rapid steps are taken to reverse the trend. Sooner or later we will have a ministry of education in each state, and our governing boards will be out of work.

  With regard to Management, the major problem is to get educators to realize that educational management is basically no different from management of any large organization with a large budget, numbers of personnel, and a labor-intensive work situation. The California State University, with its one billion dollar budget, and its 36,000 employees is basically no different, as far as management is concerned, from Chrysler, Ford, and other nonprofit organizations. The techniques of management can be taught--we are in fact teaching them on our campuses. The problem is to get educational administrators to realize that they need the training. The death rattles of the institutions that are currently going out of business because of poor management could be considerably lessened in the future if this point were realized, and if we could devise some innovative method of getting educators to recognize the problem. Management is management. Classroom experience does not always qualify one for success in that field.

- Finally, Public Service. Obviously, a college or university must serve the public in more ways than just educating its students. It can and should be a cultural center wherever and whenever possible. But attempts are being made recently to make the university into something which it is not and never can be. A university is not a social welfare agency or a psychiatric clinic, and yet constant attempts are made to push universities in these directions. A university is not primarily a hotel or a food service or an entertainment center, nor is it a political platform nor--although some will debate this--is it an agency to bring about social change. It is not even a democracy. In fact, it is just the opposite of a democracy because it is designed as a facility to enable subjective professional judgment to separate the sheep from the goats at the intellectual level. There are constant attempts being made to wrench the university into the form of the political state, where decisions are made by votes of the majority; to have the university as a "cure-all" for social problems, for problems of every sort which are besetting a troubled society. Unless we begin to recognize that the university can only take on so many of these extracurricular jobs effectively without injuring its basic mission, we will gradually destroy the university as an educational institution, and it will take us centuries to rebuild it. These other jobs are all worthy objectives and the university should certainly participate in them wherever possible, but the current demand upon the academy today is such that they are becoming a destructive force.

All of these areas present notable opportunities for the type of innovation and change that might well win some alert college or university next year's G. Theodore Mitau Award.

I will end my presumptuous suggestions on an optimistic note. There are so many of these problems and they are increasing so rapidly in size and ponderousness that the opportunities for institutions to win the Mitau Award by thinking up new methods of solving new problems are more numerous than ever. There is a vast and exciting field for academic ingenuity. And this exploration can be undertaken with the assurance that what we are trying to save is well worth preserving—the best and most effective higher educational system in the world.

The winner of the award this year is Georgia State University for its Career Information System. Georgia State confronted and moved to solve a problem that has beset educators for many years—how to relate an educational curriculum to job placement. Development of computer technology occurred at a time to enable Georgia State to approach this problem in an entirely new way and to reach, by means of micro-technology, thousands of people throughout the state of Georgia who otherwise could not have benefited. The system gives individuals information on how to search for a job, where to go to prepare for it, where the job opportunities are, and exactly how to engage in the process of finding one's vocational place. It is adaptable both to students and persons unacquainted with academic processes and techniques. It is a worthy recipient of the G. Theodore Mitau Award for 1981.

There were two runners-up in this year's award competition. One was a project by Jersey City State College which had to do with the science of Limnology—the restoration of a polluted lake. The science departments at Jersey City State entered into this project with energy and enthusiasm and the success of both students and faculty in this activity brought about the cooperation of local and state government in further pursuit of these fresh water studies.

The other runner-up was Herbert H. Lehman College of the City University of New York, with its City and Humanities Program aimed at taking the low income, urban student clientele and acquainting it with areas of education, culture, and the curriculum outside of the job placement field. Through the program, students of Herbert H. Lehman—primarily from the Bronx and over 60 percent ethnic minority—are introduced to the humanities, the arts, and the social sciences which the city has to offer. It is bringing about a new relationship between these students and their urban environment, which will inevitably have a positive effect upon good citizenship as well as the broadening of cultural horizons on a massive urban stage.

I congratulate the current recipient and I wish you all well in your future endeavors toward this worthy recognition. I know Ted Mitau would be very pleased to see how this award is being granted and how effective it has already been in bringing about the goals for which he struggled during his very effective professional career.

CONCURRENT SESSION ADDRESSES

The concurrent sessions of the annual meeting provide an opportunity for attendees to grapple with specific issues of particular importance. The panel discussions and informal question and answer formats often adopted at these sessions allow members the opportunity for dialogue. Thus, like general session addresses, they are essential to the success of the annual meeting, and the Association is enormously grateful to session participants for their assistance. Although budgetary constraints precluded our printing the concurrent session addresses in their entirety, the following descriptions of the sessions will provide readers with the names of participants and a summary of the issues covered in each session. Beginning with this annual meeting, the concurrent session addresses will be reviewed for consideration for separate publication in the AASCU Studies series.

Computer Graphic Impact Upon Education

Participants:

John Lott Brown (presiding)
University of South Florida

J. Lamar Allen
University of South Florida

James C. Bowers
University of South Florida

Oscar N. Garcia
University of South Florida

Sponsored by AASCU's Committee on Communications Technology, this session highlighted advances in computer technology with particular focus on computer graphics.

The Campus and the System: Different Perspectives

Participants:

William R. Monat (presiding)
Northern Illinois University

Glenn S. Dumke
The California State University

George R. Field
University of Wisconsin-River Falls

Edwin C. Nelson
Chadron State College, NE

Jean Spencer
Board of Trustees of the State
University and Colleges, MD

Panelists presented a variety of views on the degree of flexibility a president or chancellor has in determining where budget cuts will fall on the campus.

Stopping Fraud and Ensuring Quality

Participants:

Myron L. Coulter (presiding)
Idaho State University

Lyn Gubser
National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

Richard Millard
Council on Postsecondary Accreditation

Fraudulent institutions and academic programs were the focus of this session, which pinpointed three ways in which fraud can be perpetuated: creating the fraudulent, submarginal, or barely marginal instituion; offering off-campus programs without quality controls; and using computer-assisted institutions that extend beyond the campus, state, and regional boundaries.

Conflict or Cooperation? Determining Who Benefits From State Student Aid

Participants:

Max Sherman (presiding)
West Texas State University

Foster Frank Diebold
Edinboro State College, PA

James Amsler
Salem State College, MA

This session focused on the politics of conflict and cooperation between public and private institutions in determining who benefits from student aid. The competition for state student-aid money was discussed with particular reference to the situations in Texas, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts.

Improving Education for the Cities' People: A Shared Responsibility

Participants:

William J. Maxwell (presiding)
Jersey City State College, NJ

H. Douglas Covington
Winston-Salem State University, NC

Joseph E. Brazeinski
Denver Public Schools, CO

Lottie Shackelford
Little Rock City Hall, AR

Panelists discussed the roles of the urban college or university and the difficulties they face, such as changing demographies and declining enrollments and increasing costs.

Scientific Manpower Needs: The Crisis Ahead

Participants:

Arliss L. Roaden (presiding)
Tennessee Technological University

James Rutherford
American Association for the Advancement of Science

Paul Maxwell
Committee on Science and Technology

Harry Wugalter
Rockwell International

The pool of scientific manpower in the United States is shrinking, according to panelists addressing this session. They cited as a central problem the fact that industrial salaries and benefits are drawing away secondary and college faculty and calling into question the ability of our institutions to train scientists and engineers adequately.

AASCU/PRC Educational Relations

Thomas B. Day (presiding)
San Diego State University, CA

This session was highlighted by the signing of two major exchange agreements between AASCU and the External Relations Committee with the six institutions of higher learning in Shanghai (of the People's Republic of China) and between AASCU the Higher Education Cooperation Commission of the Province of Anhui (PRC).

A Decade of Alternatives and Innovation in Retrospect

Participants:

Lee Vickers (presiding)
Lewis-Clark State College, ID

Charles Bunting
American Council on Education

William P. Haas
North Adams State College, MA

Larraine R. Matusak
Thomas A. Edison State College, NJ

The purpose of innovation in higher education is not to be different but to improve in order to meet the needs of the vastly increased number of students now involved in higher education. Participants of this session assessed the innovative programs of the last ten years to see where the greatest progress has been made, in order to suggest some directions for future efforts.

State Government Intrusion: Hands Off?

Participants:

John P. Mellon (presiding)
Western State College of Colorado

Robert Andringa
Education Commission of the States

Franklin G. Matsler
Board of Regents, IL

Leonard Goodall
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Andrew Billingsley
Morgan State University, MD

Centralized coordinating and governing bodies in the states have brought neither increased efficiency nor enhanced quality to higher education, the panelists argued, even though state legislatures often support such oversight by their staffs or state agencies.

Quality as Thinking Skills—Achievements of the Academic Program Evaluation Project (APEP)

Participants:

James H. Young (presiding)
State University College at Potsdam, NY

Robert P. Bell
Ball State University, IN

Donald W. Zacharias
Western Kentucky University

William P. Haas
North Adams State College, MA

Lyle E. Seymour
Wayne State College, NE

George T. Potter
Ramapo College of New Jersey

Harold F. Robinson
Western Carolina University, NC

Participants in AASCU's Academic Program Evaluation Project (APEP) discussed how their APEP projects have helped them define academic quality. The session focused on how faculties worked on the problem, what evaluation instruments were used, and what college presidents felt about the overall endeavor.

AASCU/India Educational Cooperation and Exchange

E. K. Fretwell Jr. (presiding)
The University of North Carolina
at Charlotte

The visit of a delegation of vice chancellors of Indian universities, as well as officials from the Indian embassy, resulted in a discussion of the follow-up activities and future plans resulting from AASCU's mission to India in December 1980.

SPOUSES CONCURRENT SESSIONS

Friend-Raising in the Community

Participants:

Joyce Mellon (presiding)
Western State College
of Colorado

Mary Glennen
Western New Mexico University

Rose Mary McCarthy
Framingham State College, MA

Joanne Johnson
George Mason University, VA

Variations on the Theme: The President's Spouse and . . .

Participants:

Elvera Tomlinson (presiding)
Mesa College, CO

The Volunteer Career

Beatrice Covington
Winston-Salem State University, NC

The Newly Begun, Salaried Career

Nancy Cardozier
University of Texas of the Permian Basin

The Continuing Salaried Career

Judy Guskin
University of Wisconsin-Parkside

The Governing Board From Alpha to Omega

Participants:

Fran Marvel (presiding)
Consortium of State Colleges
in Colorado

Philip A. Winslow
Consortium of State Colleges
in Colorado

George Woodard
Consortium of State Colleges
in Colorado

A Brief Introduction to the PRC

Participants:

Gwen LaBounty (presiding)
California State Polytechnic
University, Pomona

Winona Malpass
Western Illinois University

Reva Bond
University of Northern Colorado

Nini Horn
California State University,
Long Beach

Interpretors at Home: Translating Campus Life for the Foreign Students

Participants:

Mary Cleary
California State University,
Northridge

Laurie Potter
Ramapo College of New Jersey

Winona Malpass
Western Illinois University

Spouses of AASCU presidents attended a variety of workshops during the course of the annual meeting, a highlight being the keynote address to spouses by Marguerite Walker Corbally who discussed her book, The Partners: Sharing the Life of A College President, and the changes that have taken place in the perception of spouses' roles since it was written.

REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN

Roland Dille
President
Moorhead State University, Minnesota

The Summer Council of Presidents at Northern Arizona University in July was more important to me symbolically than practically. That the Summer Council, where I have so often profited from the advice and conversation of wise colleagues should this year have failed me is not surprising, for I wasn't there.

One of the pleasures of my election as chairman was the knowledge that I would serve in a year during which the Summer Council would meet, that I would help to plan it, and that I would play a not, I hoped, insignificant role in it.

We did plan it, and I did arrive at Flagstaff where, on the weekend before meetings began, I presided at a meeting of the Board of Directors. But when the Summer Council meetings began I was back at Moorhead State, hastily recalled when the first state employees strike in Minnesota history took many of our classified employees from their jobs. It was generally agreed that, since no one knew what to expect from a strike, college presidents should not only be on duty but should seem to be on duty. And so I spent the week looking out my office window at pickets on the prairie against a backdrop, distant and invisible, of the mountains of northern Arizona.

My wife, whom I abandoned in Flagstaff, said that everything went splendidly without me, a report I found less comforting than I should have.

And so I am left with symbols.

For instance, one of the great values of AASCU is that it gives us opportunities to share our experiences, and such lessons as experience has provided us, with one another. One of the things I felt most keenly during the days of the Summer Council and the strike was regret that I had left behind me those very people I wanted most to talk to about the problems I was facing.

This seems to me to be the mark of AASCU's success as an organization, and it is a result of another AASCU success: more than any other large organization that I know of, it involves its members in its work, in committees that do things and in meetings that are about something. To the sense of responsibility for our own institutions and for higher education, a burden, if that is what it is, that none of us can escape, is added a sense of responsibility both for one another and for the organization.

But, unfortunately, when crisis on the campus comes, it comes to each of us alone. And, of course, as I found, responsibility for the organization, which the chairman, surely, should feel most strongly, yields to those other responsibilities back home.

That this is so reduces not at all the importance of AASCU. The strike I had to deal with this summer was the kind of crisis that all college presidents will face in the 1980s. Not that all of us, or, even, perhaps, many of us, will face strikes, but there will be mani-

festations of tensions that are now forming. Our strike was over simple economic issues, a result of inflation and of the recession that has so badly affected tax receipts in most of our states.

The rate of inflation may drop, and the recession may end, but we are, it would seem, only at the beginning of a change in attitude toward the nature and scope of public enterprise and expenditure. One does not have to be convinced that the present administration will succeed in putting into effect a new public philosophy, very different from that which has governed our thinking for a half century, to recognize that public support for all kinds of activities will decline. And even if one believes that this is, on balance, a good thing, one would have to admit that those who preside over state colleges and universities will face difficult problems.

I find it hard, looking back over the thirteen years that I have been a college president, years which were marked by all sorts of difficulties, to find myself thinking of them as a kind of Golden Age. They were, for all their difficulties, years in which many people looked at our efforts with favor. If society viewed us with somewhat less confidence than they had in the years just previous, there were still great expectations of us and a sense that what we were doing was important and useful.

Different priorities and tighter budgets need not be taken as absolute evidence that expectations have faded, but there are other reasons for concern. We have known that our culture is in many ways hostile to education, but we have regarded that hostility as unconscious; that is television, the desire for meretricious gratifications, suspicion of personal discipline—all of those things that make the education of the young so difficult—these were only accidentally our enemy.

There are reasons to fear the growth of a conscious and directed hostility. Who better than us to earn the enmity of those who fear the critical intelligence, who defend the unexamined life? If learning itself is suspect, who will speak for the universities?

I have another fear. I would like to believe that a commitment to a broad and general opportunity for education is not something that occasionally concerns us, but that it is, for our kinds of institutions, central to our purposes. Let us make no large claims for our pioneering courage; our record, until recently, was dismal enough. But surely, now, at last, there is no turning back, not from a job so far from finished, still so imperfectly done.

There are murmurs of satisfaction that changes in government programs will fall upon the rich and the poor, upon white and non-white, upon men and women. We have even, ourselves, found it hard to distinguish between useful and useless regulation, and welcomed change.

But these are only a couple of instances that point to a new temper in the land, a temper unsympathetic to our purposes, suspicious of our activities, promising all sorts of difficulties for us.

An organization allows for a collective attack on problems. AASCU, as it has in the past, will give us the means for collective action. But more important than that, it provides us with opportunities to think together, to share hard-won knowledge and wise speculation, to remind one another of our purposes, so that we go better armed into the battles that will surely come.

It is the good fortune of the chairman to work closely with many college presidents and to talk to many more. I have come to believe that the college presidents of this country represent a public resource too valuable to be hidden on their campuses. We have not often sought public leadership, have not often raised our voices as citizens and human beings. We scarcely have time to get our own jobs done; we must attend to all sorts of political imperatives. We have not, as presidents of state colleges and universities, been able to take refuge in ivory towers, but have we not too often been content to whitewash our cottages and cultivate our gardens?

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

Allan W. Ostar

When I spoke to you this time last year, the country has just elected a new president, and in my report to you then I commented that "it is too early to say what the implications of the election will mean for higher education (but) there are, of course, some reasons for great concern."

Now, one year later, the implications are painfully clear. The decade of the '80s is shaping up as one of the most challenging and difficult that we in higher education have ever faced.

I would like to think that because of our longstanding efforts always to be prepared for the unexpected, our institutions are in better shape than most to withstand this onslaught. I believe we can all agree, however, that no matter how well prepared we are, it would have been difficult to anticipate the magnitude of the recent and proposed cuts in federal support for higher education.

Our country has long placed the highest priority on providing the opportunity for a quality education for all citizens. It has taken years of hard work on the part of those of us in higher education and in government to make this possible. Now, however, over a period of just a few months, the budget cuts are evolving as sheer economic vandalism of our education system from kindergarten right through post-doctoral research.

Our productivity depends on advances in technology and science, yet the administration's budget reduces support for science and engineering education by 86 percent. Last year, Japan, a country with half our population, graduated more electrical engineers than we did. You can imagine the competitive loss in the next decade if our science and engineering budget is gutted.

Our economic progress depends on increasing our pool of talented human capital and decreasing the number of uneducated who are consigned to unemployment and welfare. Yet the administration in Washington proooses to cut $1 billion from Guaranteed Student Loans and about $900 million from Pell Grants, the most important federal commitment to student access. In addition, the entire sum of student survivor benefits under social security, about $2 billion, are to be terminated. Numerous other programs that directly or indirectly benefit higher education are also scheduled to be greatly reduced or in many cases terminated altogether.

Compounding all this is the misunderstanding that we are reducing federal spending. Well, let's get it straight—federal spending is not being reduced. Instead, the investment in the development of our human resources is being reduced by more than 15 percent, while the administration proposes to spend 36 percent more for military manpower and hardware.

The proposals to reduce student aid for lower- and middle-income families are critical for AASCU institutions. A recent AASCU survey of over 200 state colleges and univer-

sities indicated that many colleges have received far less federal student aid this fall than they believe is needed to help their students. A substantial majority of the institutions reported to AASCU that students have had to drop out of college or attend part-time because of cutbacks in student aid for the fall of 1981, combined with rising college costs.

Much larger cuts in aid are under active consideration for next year by the U.S. Senate.

These cuts, of course, could not come at a worse time. Our institutions are facing tremendous jumps in cost. The increases result in part from inflation; in part because of the recession-reduced state revenues many states are suffering; and in part because states, caught up in the cycle of shifting more budget responsibilities to the federal government, have reduced support for institutions.

In the face of all this, where can a state institution turn for simple economic survival? The most obvious, although in my judgment the most dangerously short range, solution is to raise tuition.

In the past, increasing tuition at public colleges has been justified by pointing to the existence of student aid and alleging that "no needy student will be denied an education" even with higher tuition. This was never true—there was never enough student aid to meet the need, and student aid formulas were biased in such a way that almost all public college students, even those from very low-income families, received less aid than needed. Now, it's a certainty that these students will receive less aid, and as our October survey indicates, many are simply not going to be able to attend at all, and each year the number who cannot attend will surely increase.

It becomes more important than ever, then, for institutions to keep tuition at the lowest possible level. A higher priority must be placed on the states' ability to support higher education at state institutions. Otherwise, we are going to lose one of the things that we hold dear in public higher education—higher education opportunities for all.

Clearly, the federal role in public higher education is going to be greatly diminished in the '80s. With less money available from the government for student aid and research, for the first time in several years attention is shifting back to the states because that is where the funding battles will be fought. I believe that it is incumbent upon AASCU to place greater emphasis on its state relations program. To that end, I have directed our governmental relations staff to enhance its already close liaison with state-related national organizations, such as the National Governors Association, the National Conference of State Legislatures, and the Education Conference of the States. We are exploring with them and with individual state leaders the possibility that they will join with us in saying to Congress and the president, "Enough is enough." There are already strong indications that many Republican as well as Democratic leaders in Congress feel that reducing domestic spending in education and other programs may have gone far enough.

These congressional attitudes in turn reflect all the letters and personal appeals that members of Congress have had from you and other college presidents and from spokespersons for every state and local program that is being hurt by reduced federal spending.

If enough governors and legislatures come to feel that federal spending in domestic areas should not be further reduced, in part because states do not have the resources to pick up federal losses, it may be that the whole tide of events in 1981 can be partly reversed.

We have had a working relationship with such groups as the NGA and NCSL for many years. Their spokespersons have appeared at our meetings, and we have had spokespersons and observers at theirs. Our staff works with their staffs. We have been successful in helping to persuade the NCSL to take a moderate position on the issue of state legislative reappropriation of federal funds, and more recently in persuading the NGA not to seek state control of all federal funds coming to colleges.

It is our hope to expand this relationship by working with these and other state officials' organizations to slow the dismantling of major programs that serve important purposes for our nation.

Very high among these programs is equal opportunity for higher education—a goal that was being encouraged by the federal government as late as 1980 with the passage of that year's Higher Education Act amendments, but which is threatened now.

We believe it is to the interest of governors and state legislatures, as well as of colleges, to protect federal student aid and other forms of aid to higher education. We are working right now toward that end.

Further proposed cuts, to be enacted by Congress, would take $600 million out of a $5.5 billion budget for basic research in fiscal 1982 and cut out $3.1 billion from all federal support of research and development.

Information on what is happening in other states is of vital importance to every one of you assembled in this room, and I hope over the next year to increase our reporting service to you so that you will have up-to-the-minute information on activities in other states to help you make decisions and policy in your own state. Finally, we need to maintain a close watch on policy debates occurring in the states and be of immediate service to you when policy decisions that affect your institutions are being made in your states.

In addition, we as public institutions are going to have to turn to the public for increased support. Even as we place more emphasis on state help, it is inevitable that the gap is going to increase between the costs of the services we provide and the state support we receive. At best, the State can provide only the basic necessities for a good education. Voluntary support provides the "margin of excellence."

For many institutions, private fund raising is a fairly new experience, at least on the level that circumstances now require. The mechanics of fund raising—organization, staffing, policies, and procedures—are often not fully developed, or may require refinement if they are to serve the long-term needs of the institutions. In an effort to help member institutions improve or even establish a mechanism for soliciting private funds, AASCU published a handbook on foundations this summer and I urge all of you to see that your vice presidents for development receive a copy.

I have asked our new public information director to spend a great deal of time working with our institutions in an effort to find new and better ways to approach the problems inherent in soliciting private funds. Indeed, the PR committee at its meeting on Monday took under consideration a Foundation Policy Statement.

I believe that if we work together, give greater attention to those programs and activities that will do the most to direct needed funds to our institutions, then we will be able to hold the line on massive tuition increases.

Public colleges and universities are the springboards from which generations of students have taken their places as respected citizens and important contributors to American Society. The values these colleges impart are basic: that education is an opportunity to better oneself as an individual; that education is an opportunity to better society through one's knowledge; and that all men have a responsibility to their fellow men. Society is better for these values. It will continue to get better as long as we are able to provide increasing numbers of students with the opportunity to learn at our institutions.

REPORT OF THE TREASURER

Rodney A. Briggs
President, Eastern Oregon State College

I am pleased to report that, at the end of the first year of our three-year dues cycle, the Association is in excellent financial position. That very positive position is a direct result of increased memberships, reduced expenses in running the Association, and increased investment income.

I would ask that each of you review the financial report in the 1981 Annual Report, as I believe it accurately reflects the positive financial position of the Association. Comments seem desirable in three areas:

1. **Revolving fund:** The audit and some internal budgetary changes reflect the action of the Board of Directors this past year to establish a revolving fund to handle those functions and activities that can be considered self-supporting. The revolving fund activities, including the annual meeting and funding of the reciprocal agreements for overseas missions, show a balance of $16,788, representing income balances over expenses during fiscal 1981.

2. **Reserve funds:** A permanent reserve fund has been designated to maintain the Association, if necessary, through an adjustment period if all grant and contract activities were to cease. The permanent reserve then would maintain all membership activities of the Association.

The permanent reserve fund has been increased by $100,000 this year to a total of $400,000. It is the board's belief that to ensure the continuation of the membership activities the permanent reserve fund must be adjusted annually or whenever possible to reflect the rate of inflation. This increase is a response to that concern.

The Association's operating reserve, after taking into account several commitments made by the board after an adjustment to recognize the remaining costs of furniture and equipment purchased in prior years and yet to be depreciated, is now at $235,000.

The commitments made by the board (which include the necessary funds to cover inflation in the third year of the three-year dues cycle, the dues themselves remaining constant during the three years) have allowed for continued support of the Office for the Advancement of Public Negro Colleges, for funds to support the expenses associated with the Mitau award, and for the establishment of a fund for producing marketable publications.

The board believes that these special activities, which go beyond those funded through the three-year membership budget, reflect an Association commitment and are beneficial to the membership at large.

It is important to understand the reasons for the increase in reserves this year. A substantial part was the increase in investment income, which exceeded estimates by

$43,000 for an increase of $108,000. The increase can directly be attributed to the changes announced last year in the Association's investment policy. Last October, the Association started investing in the Continental Illinois Bank, using the bank's short-term asset management program. This program has provided an exceptionally high yield on such investments.

Funds in the Association checking account are kept as close to zero as possible, with daily balances invested through the Government Investors Trust, a money market fund located in Washington, DC.

Increased membership is a source of increased fund balances, reflecting a new high in Association membership.

The Association realized an increase in indirect cost recovery and was able to reduce expenses by approximately $75,000. Of these savings, $35,000 were in those activities covered by the membership budget, with $40,000 saved in general administrative costs outside that budget.

Grant and contract activity continues to account for about half of the Association's $3 million annual budget, with membership-sponsored programs and general administrative expenses making up the other half. And finally.

3. **Dues Rebate**: Because of the positive financial position of the Association, due primarily to increased membership and cost cutting in the Association's offices, the Board of Directors has approved a 4 percent rebate in dues for 1983. This will show as a reduction in the invoice for the third year of the budget cycle—a recognition that many institutions are going through troubled financial times and that the Association should also share with the institutions in some of this trouble.

I must pay a tribute to Ms. Lynn Dickey, who served as the Director of Administration at AASCU during these past years. We will all miss her. Her final letter to me indicated that the staff had received a draft of the management letter prepared by the auditors, and it was so short this year that it will be distributed in memo form—a direct tribute to the Washington staff of AASCU.

I believe that in this period of gloom and uncertainty "our" Association is in a sound fiscal condition.

REPORT ON THE COUNCIL ON POSTSECONDARY ACCREDITATION

Robert Ewigleben
President, Ferris State College, Michigan

During the last year the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA) has undertaken two very significant activities that I believe bear on the future of accreditation: (1) the selection of Richard Millard as President of COPA; and (2) the initiation of a self-study of COPA's performance in terms of its goals, its financing, its board participation, and its staff effectiveness.

The idea of a self-study by COPA was first proposed in September 1979. Since 1980 would mark the fifth year of the Council's existence, it seemed an appropriate time to assess COPA's performance. The board approved the self-study and the president, at the April 9, 1980, meeting, reported that it should be underway shortly with a scheduled completion date of spring 1981. However, because of the resignation of the president, the Executive Committee in May 1980 decided to defer the self-study until a new president could be chosen.

The new president, Richard Millard, assumed office on February 1, 1981. Immediately thereafter, a request was sent to the constituent accrediting associations, the national higher education organizations, and other selected organizations for nominations of members to serve on an Advisory Panel with primary responsibility for conducting the self-study in cooperation with the Executive Committee.

Approximately 190 nominations were received from 68 persons and organizations for the nine-member panel. The selection of the panel members was made by the Executive Committee at its meeting on March 20, 1981, in Kansas City. At that meeting the Executive Committee also approved a preliminary work plan and a charge for the panel, whose membership included:

Dr. Lloyd H. Elliott
President
George Washington University
Washington, DC 20052

Sister Ann Ida Gannon
Professor of Philosophy
Mundelein College
6363 Sheridan Road
Chicago, IL 60660

Dr. Thomas J. Ginley
Associated Executive Director
for Policy and Planning
American Dental Association
211 East Chicago Avenue
Chicago, IL 60611

Dr. Kenneth L. Moll
Acting Vice President for
Academic Affairs and
Associate Dean of Faculties
University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52242

Mrs. Mary Louise Peterson
Chair, Iowa Board of Regents
1411 10th Street
Harland, IA 51637

Dr. Bill J. Priest
Chancellor-Emeritus
Dallas County Community
College District
Dallas, TX 75202

Dr. Robert R. Ramsey, Jr.
Chancellor
West Virginia Board of Regents
950 Kanawha Boulevard, East
Charleston, WV 25301

Dr. Robert H. Strotz
President
Northwestern University
Evanston, IL 60201

Howard R. Bowen, Chairman
R. Stanton Avery, Professor
of Economics
Claremont Graduate School
Claremont, CA 91711

The work of the panel was to be completed so that the specialized and institutional assemblies could review the recommendations prior to the October board meeting of COPA.

According to the panel, the current objectives need focus and reformulation. The governance structure should be consolidated and more directly related to the objectives and to the role of accreditation as the academic community's primary means of self-regulatory quality assessment and enhancement. The financial base should be broadened and reflect the institutional and program base of accreditation. Priority issues should reflect COPA objectives and the changing nature of postsecondary education.

The panel recommended that COPA's primary task be to monitor the accreditation process and to ensure that it is conducted effectively and responsibly in the interests of students and the general public. In doing this, it has three major functions: (1) to recognize accrediting associations on the basis of demonstrated need and specific standards relating to accrediting policies and procedures; (2) to provide leadership in postsecondary accreditation; and (3) to provide services to the accrediting associations, postsecondary institutions, and the public in relation to accreditation.

On governance, the panel recommended that (1) the size of the COPA board be reduced from 40 to 15 elected and 4 ex-officio members; (2) the composition of the board reflect more adequately institutional and public concerns with accreditation; (3) the name be changed to the Commission of Postsecondary Accreditation; and (4) a third constituent group of National Postsecondary Organizations be incorporated as a parallel council with the Councils of Institutional and Specialized Accrediting Bodies.

In relation to finance, the panel recommended that (1) in harmony with the institutional and program base of accreditation, the major portion of the dues be collected directly from institutions on a scale of assessment related to institutional size rather than indirectly through accrediting associations and (2) accrediting agencies and national postsecondary organizations be assessed a uniform fee.

The panel recommended that the priorities be closely related to objectives and be constantly reviewed in the light of changing circumstances.

Finally, the panel recommended that self-studies and reviews such as this be established on a regular cycle every three to five years.

With respect to the financing of COPA, an interim plan was adopted that continues the current practice of assessing the member institutional and specialized accrediting agencies and the participating national institutional associations. As outlined, the plan would obtain 60 percent of COPA's support from the institutional accrediting agencies, 30 percent from the specialized agencies and 10 percent from the national associations. This would reduce the assessments of the institutional accrediting agencies by 15 percent while increasing those of the specialized agencies some two and one-half times on the average, and raise the national association contribution from $1,250 to $5,000, each. This would be viewed as an interim plan that would make possible the phasing-in of direct institutional billing over a three-year period.

The COPA board took action at their October meeting and, for the most part, accepted the recommendations of the panel. They did decide, however, that the name will not be changed.

With respect to the COPA Board of Directors, the following was approved:

1. **Membership**: With the exception of ex-officio and public members, the board shall consist of persons holding positions of responsibility in accredited institutions or programs of postsecondary education.

2. **Composition of the board**: The board shall consist of 15 elected members plus four ex-officio members distributed as follows:

   - Three members elected by the Council of Institutional Accrediting Bodies.
   - Three members elected by the Council of Specialized Accrediting Bodies.
   - Three members elected by the Council of National Postsecondary Educational Organizations.
   - Three members elected by the board from a slate of chief executive or academic officers of institutions nominated directly by institutions of postsecondary education.
   - Three members elected by the board from a slate of public representatives nominated by the three councils and such relevant public interest groups as the board shall designate.
   - Four ex-officio members:

     The chairmen of the three councils

     The president of COPA, who shall also serve as secretary of the board.

Regular board members shall serve terms of three years each and shall be eligible for reelection to a second term. Board terms shall be staggered to ensure continuity. Other members shall serve concurrently with the terms of their respective ex-officio appointments. The ex-officio members shall serve without vote, except in the election of board members.

REPORT ON THE OFFICE FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF PUBLIC NEGRO COLLEGES

Leonard Haynes
Director, Office for the Advancement of Public Negro Colleges

To the distinguished members on the platform and the chief executives of institutions who are represented at this conference, I am delighted to have this opportunity to provide you with a brief report on some of the activities of the Office for the Advancement of Public Negro Colleges (OAPNC) for 1981. Before I begin, I would like to express my sincere appreciation to Allan Ostar, Harold Delaney, and the staff of AASCU for their continued support and encouragement of the OAPNC program. Without their help, OAPNC would not enjoy the success it has had since 1969. For those of you who are not familiar with OAPNC, the office represents the 34 historically black public institutions located in 18 states. Five of the institutions are located in North Carolina. Sixteen of the institutions are land-grant colleges. Two have pharmacy schools, while 26 have graduate programs including five that now offer doctoral degrees. Three institutions have law schools and 21 of the 34 institutions are members of AASCU, including some land-grant institutions. OAPNC's members enroll over 60 percent of all students who attend the nation's 88 historically black four-year institutions. Thus, they play a significant role in providing educational opportunities to blacks and other Americans.

OAPNC is an office of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC) in cooperation with AASCU. Attached to the office is an advisory committee whose members are chosen by NASULGC and AASCU. Representing AASCU on the committee are Presidents Joseph Johnson, Douglas Covington, Thomas Graves, and Harrison Wilson. The office is now going into its third year in Washington after being in Atlanta, Georgia, for nine years. Essentially, the office is concerned with raising the visibility of these institutions before the public and initiating and assisting in the development of strategies designed to strengthen and enhance these institutions. In this respect, OAPNC cooperates with both NASULGC and AASCU in support of their development efforts for these important national educational resources.

Presently, we are focusing on three areas: One involves the humanities program that we've conducted for the National Endowment for the Humanities. A major conference held at Savannah State College, an AASCU member, reported on OAPNC's efforts to break new ground in developing a curriculum designed to strengthen and expand the humanities programs in black institutions by focusing on the experience of black and white southerners. The Savannah conference attracted national attention, as reported by the Chronicle. Not only were black institutions present, but also representatives of white institutions, like Georgia Southern were there. The National Endow-

ment for the Humanities has asked us to submit a new proposal designed to expand the effort to include approximately 20 institutions in the OAPNC group.

The second effort that is underway is developing meaningful and constructive linkages between black public institutions and the private sector. Most of you probably saw the article in the Chronicle, reporting on the conference held on the campus of Texas Southern University involving the chief executives of OAPNC and representatives of the private sector headquartered in Houston, Texas. This conference dovetailed with President Reagan's private sector initiative; at least we seemed to be the first ones to try it out and I am optimistic that it is going to work because corporate representatives were receptive. They pointed out, however, that they were not going to respond to the needs of higher education unless they met the self-interest of the corporation. In this regard, I have met with William Carpenter, the Senior Vice President of Tennaco Oil, and OAPNC has been asked to submit a proposal to Tennaco about how OAPNC can help Tennaco respond to the particular needs of black colleges as they relate to Tennaco's self interest.

OAPNC is trying to ensure that it becomes the best source of information and data on historically black public institutions. Presently, there exists no good source, and I think it is OAPNC's responsibility since this was one of the reasons for establishing the office. We are going to work very hard in 1982 to come up with ways to become the best source of information on these institutions.

Finally, I want to share with you the fact that Vice President Buch has called a meeting to discuss how President Reagan's initiative on black colleges will be implemented. Persons who will be invited to this meeting will be the presidents of the historically black colleges, educational associations, federal agency heads, and private sector representatives. It is anticipated that this meeting will serve as a springboard to more meaningful and constructive linkages between historically black public institutions and the federal government.

In closing, I appreciate your support and encouragement. Should you have questions or desire further information regarding the work of OAPNC, please do not hesitate to contact me.

OAPNC'S FIVE POINT PROGRAM

1) Increasing institutional capacities to better interpret and explain black public colleges and universities to relevant publics (e.g., state coordinating authorities, foundations, corporations) to secure their understanding and support.

2) Developing institutional capacities to enable black public colleges and universities to increase and expand their participation in the programs of state and federal governments.

3) Increasing institutional capacities of black public colleges and universities to respond effectively to the opportunities offered by desegregation.

4) Developing institutional capacities to enable black public colleges and universities to take full advantage of the programs of NASULGC and AASCU, especially in the

areas of agriculture, international programs, urban affairs, rural development, and environmental concerns.

5) Assisting black public colleges and universities to increase and expand their overall effectiveness to provide more and better educational opportunities for black Americans.

79

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were affirmed by the membership:

Sexual Harassment

WHEREAS, Academic freedom, and the special protection it affords those engaged in teaching and learning, is a fundamental principle of American Higher Education; and

WHEREAS, Aggressive acts of a sexual nature which intimidate those so engaged in the pursuit and advancement of knowledge are antithetical to the principle of academic freedom; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the American Association of State Colleges and Universities proclaims and adopts as its policy the following statement on Sexual Harassment.

POLICY STATEMENT ON SEXUAL HARASSMENT

Sexual harassment is a form of sex discrimination that is both reprehensible and unlawful. When it occurs on the campus, sexual harassment is contrary to the most fundamental ethical canons of the academic community. Sexual harassment violates the special bond of intellectual dependence and trust between students and faculty. Moreover, it undermines the collegial process of recruitment, appointment, and advancement at the institution.

Accordingly, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities holds that sexual harassment is intolerable and threatening to the vitality of the academic community. It therefore urges all educational institutions to take action to prevent sexual harassment of students and employees and to respond to complaints concerning such acts.

Among the specific steps that should be taken by institutions in combatting sexual harassment, the most important are the development and dissemination of a written policy prohibiting sexual harassment of students and employees, together with the establishment of grievance procedures to handle sexual harassment complaints. Such grievance procedures should contain appropriate provisions for confidentiality and protection of complainants from retaliation as well as mechanisms for ensuring due process protections for respondents. While such grievance procedures may or may not be the same as other existing grievance procedures, their effectiveness may be enhanced by the inclusion of initial informal procedures followed by more formal procedures if the complaint is not resolved.

The American Association of State Colleges and Universities hereby affirms its commitment to the creation of an academic environment free of acts of sexual harassment, and encourages its member institutions to continue their individual efforts to ensure the full achievement of this important goal.

Joint Council Representation

WHEREAS, Title XIV creating the Joint Council of the U.S. Department of Agriculture has provided for two representatives of public non-land grant colleges and universities; and

WHEREAS, An institutional head in the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and a representative of the American Association of University Agricultural Administrators from an AASCU institution have provided this representation for the last several years; and

WHEREAS, Legislation is now pending before Congress that would realign the membership of the Joint Council; and

WHEREAS, Developments in the fields of science and education in the various areas of agriculture are of increased importance in public non-land grant institutions of higher education and to the people they serve; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the American Association of State Colleges and Universities urges the Congress of the United States and its committees concerned with agriculture to provide that the public non-land grant representation on the Joint Council not be decreased; and, in fact, AASCU requests that the proportion of public non-land grant representation be increased.

Collegiate Athletics

WHEREAS, Greater involvement of presidents and chancellors is desired in administering and managing college athletics; and

WHEREAS, There are ongoing and immediate issues facing institutions in athletics; and

WHEREAS, The forum and mechanism for resolution of these issues are within the three major athletic associations; and

WHEREAS, Each president or chancellor must determine his/her own institutional position on these issues in consultation with their athletic directors, faculty representatives, student athletes, and athletic conference; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That: (1) all presidents and chancellors of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities make an effort to participate and involve themselves more directly in the athletic associations in which they hold membership; (2) all AASCU-NCAA members make a special effort to attend the AASCU Athletic Committee sponsored workshop and the NCAA Annual Convention in Houston in January 1982; and (3) those AASCU-NCAA members most affected by the pending division reorganization at the NCAA Special Convention in St. Louis, December 3-4, 1981, carefully examine each of the various reorganization proposals and television contract proposals before casting their institutional votes.

NAEB Commendation

WHEREAS, For nearly 50 years, the National Association for Educational Broadcasters has fought the good fight on behalf of the uses of radio and television broadcasting for educational purposes, successfully leading the charge for reserved channels for all-channel legislation, and for federal support of educational radio and television stations; and

WHEREAS, The NAEB has supported and sustained individual professionals in their growth through publications, awards, seminars, institutes and service on association committees and boards as it sought to enhance the quality of educational broadcasting and through it to enrich the lives of all Americans; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the American Association of State Colleges and Universities in this convention assembled salutes the NAEB for its extraordinary efforts in behalf of educational broadcasting.

Cable Television

WHEREAS, Many colleges, universities and non-profit institutions and groups have an active and growing interest in the utilization of cable television; and

WHEREAS, The Senate in 1981 defeated a telecommunications bill which could have denied such institutional access to cable television or forced institutions to pay very high rates; and

WHEREAS, The House of Representatives will take up similar legislation in 1982; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the American Association of State Colleges and Universities wishes to commend the Senate of the United States for leaving with local government some control over both access to cable television and rates charged for it and to urge the House of Representatives, when it considers this legislation in 1982, to take the same action.

Energy Issues

WHEREAS, Energy issues have ramifications far beyond purely technical questions and the need for immediate operational economies; and

WHEREAS, The American Association of State Colleges and Universities feels a responsibility to provide broad educational perspectives regarding energy issues; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the American Association of State Colleges and Universities urges its members to integrate energy issues throughout their curricula (e.g., ethics, economics, science, sociology, and business) wherever possible and appropriate; and be it further

RESOLVED, That institutions in the American Association of State Colleges and Universities are urged to engage in efforts to heighten consciousness concerning energy issues and to provide incentives and rewards for efficient energy use on campus.

National Imperatives for Higher Education–1982

RESOLVED, That the American Association of State Colleges and Universities adopt the following statement on National Imperatives for Higher Education–1982.

NATIONAL IMPERATIVES FOR HIGHER EDUCATION–1982

The American Association of State Colleges and Universities reaffirms its commitment to the basic principle of equality of opportunity to ensure students from all walks of life access to higher education, the equitable distribution of federal funding

to further a diverse yet effective higher education system throughout the nation, and a strengthened voice for higher education to rectify present—and prevent further—unreasonable regulation and intrusion from federal and state governments.

Higher Education and the Federal Government: A New Era?

It is still too soon to know the extent to which there will be a reversal of the trend over the past 20 years toward substantial federal support for education, research, and the training of specialists and professionals. Leaders in higher education who believe that the federal government has a legitimate and important role to play in these areas must continue to make the best case they can that a strong, federally assisted system of education and research is essential to America's future.

Colleges and universities need to pursue other strategies to maintain and improve the quality of their institutions:

- They must be prepared to make difficult choices, among conditions of scarce resources.
- They must redouble their efforts to persuade state policy makers and the public that the states, which have traditionally provided most of the support for low-tuition public higher education, should continue that support. The states ought to be prepared to make up federal losses, which could result in the decline of access or the erosion of institutional quality. Reductions in student aid make it especially important for states to provide adequate resources so that tuition and fees can be held down to reasonable levels.
- They must oppose efforts by state agencies and branches of government to assert control over federal funds to institutions and students.
- They must work closely with state governments to develop effective ways to use those federal block grant funds that become available for teacher education, research, curriculum development, public service, and other purposes. States are required under the new federal law to involve colleges and universities in planning for the use of block grants; colleges should volunteer their services.

Access to Higher Education Through Low Tuition and Student Aid

AASCU believes that every American should have the opportunity for a postsecondary education suited to his or her needs and qualifications. Lack of funds should not be a barrier to opportunity.

Those who have urged that student aid be "substituted" for low tuition have proven to be completely in error. Within a few months, changes in federal policy have partly reversed the series of legislative actions from the Higher Education Act of 1965 through the Middle-Income Student Assistance Act of 1978 and the Higher Education Act amendments in 1980. Far less student aid assistance is available and even this is threatened. Those states and institutions that raised tuition, assuming that student aid would protect the needy, are left with high student charges in an era when state resources are strained, in part by substantial federal cutbacks in other state-administered programs.

AASCU will continue to press for adequate federal student aid. We also urge state policy makers to review with great care decisions to raise tuition and other charges further. Already, the annual cost of a public, four-year college or university education in many states is for many families the equivalent of several months' salary.

About 80 percent of all students, including most lower-income, middle-income, and minority students, attend public colleges; in most states the percentage is higher. As federal student aid is reduced, these students become more dependent on relatively low tuition and fees if they are to attend college at all.

AASCU continues to reject proposals to create a "student loan bank" and similar plans that would place much more emphasis on expensive, long-term loans and large lifetime debts as a principal way to finance higher education. As far as possible, most students should be able to attend college through a combination of low tuition, work (including College Work-Study), and grants where necessary.

Tuition Tax Credits and Student Aid

AASCU is very concerned about proposals for tuition tax credits as a way to help finance higher education. Such tax credits would be highly expensive and inflationary. They would encourage both public and private colleges to raise tuition, leaving students and their families no better off than before. Further, tax credits tend to provide the most aid to upper-income students attending high-cost institutions, and the least to lower- and middle-income students at public colleges and universities.

The passage of tax credit legislation would mean the reduction of student aid. It could result in the reduction of federal grants, work-study, and loans, which provide far more aid to the great majority of students than tax credits would.

AASCU urges Congress once again to reject tax credits in favor of adequate support for the basic student aid programs, which have provided access to quality higher education for millions of Americans.

Preserving the Department of Education

The nation is now faced with proposals for the major reduction or elimination of many education programs, as well as plans to demote or completely dismantle the Department of Education.

Some proposals under active discussion would turn almost all higher education and other programs into block grants or eliminate them entirely. The only functions of the very small agency that would remain would be data collection, some research, and administration of some block grant funds. Some student aid programs would be consolidated into a block grant, and the Pell (BEOG) and Guaranteed Student Loan (GSL) programs might be dispersed to the Treasury Department. Other functions might go to such agencies as the Departments of Interior, Justice, and Labor.

Such wholesale destruction and scattering of programs carries two additional dangers. One is that experience so far in 1981 shows that block grant programs can be cut back or eliminated more easily than categorical programs. Another danger is that those programs that remain are likely to be administered by state agencies, serving the needs of state coordinating bodies rather than institutions and students. Similarly, turning programs over to agencies such as the Treasury Department, interested prima-

rily in budget-cutting and fiscal policy, could result in their further erosion or elimination.

AASCU believes that the present Department of Education and its present statutory programs should be maintained.

AASCU urges Congress to hold full hearings on any proposed reorganization, through the regular committee process. In a time when the nation is demanding a greater investment in human resources to ensure American economic productivity in the years ahead, we think that these hearings will confirm the validity of a cabinet-level Department of Education to ensure that education and human resources questions will receive the closest attention at the highest level of government.

Other Federal Programs

The federal government provides assistance for many other programs that have served the nation well.

AASCU continues to support strongly the principal programs authorized by the Higher Education Act, including aid to college libraries, developing college aid (now entitled "institutional aid"), the so-called TRIO program for the disadvantaged, the academic facilities and college housing loan programs, the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, and the urban grant university program.

AASCU also strongly favors the continuation of adequate funding levels for the following:

- National Science Foundation and especially science education
- Other research programs, including those in health and agriculture
- Health Manpower Training
- International exchange and agricultural development programs
- National Arts and Humanities Endowments
- Educational benefits for veterans and members of the armed services.

AASCU also favors tax legislation to encourage private-sector giving to higher education.

AASCU has a particular interest in legislation for adequate funding for public television and radio stations at colleges, and to protect access to cable television by educational institutions. AASCU also supports legislation to make it possible for four-year colleges and universities to participate more fully in federal Vocational Education Act funding.

AASCU Participation in Decision Making

AASCU has worked actively to have its administrators and faculty appointed to such national boards as the National Science Board, National Council on the Humanities,

National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, Board of International Food and Agricultural Development, and other agencies. We will continue to do so, in order that this important sector of higher education, representing one-fourth of all college students, is not neglected in policy formulation.

In cooperation with several government agencies, AASCU has worked for several years to develop extensive lists of AASCU faculty members who can serve as peer reviewers for proposals submitted to the National Science Foundation and other agencies. This effort enables AASCU institutions to provide talented faculty and administrators who can assist in the resolution of national problems.

Federal/State/Institutional Relations

AASCU has been chosen by the other major higher education associations to be the "lead agent" in monitoring developments in the states that can affect higher education adversely. AASCU played a key part in opposing a move toward state legislative reappropriation of federal funds going to colleges and universities. While some states have passed such legislation, many have exempted higher education largely or entirely. In part, this has resulted from cooperative activities involving AASCU and the National Conference of State Legislatures. After careful study, the latter group recommended that federal funds coming to higher education not be subject to reappropriation.

More recently, AASCU was involved in a successful effort to persuade the National Governors Association (NGA) not to seek state agency control over federal research funds and student aid. However, NGA may still seek control over other forms of federal aid to public and private colleges and universities. This issue will require further vigilance at the state and federal levels.

AASCU has also opposed attempts to amend federal law to give state agencies more control over higher education, whether directly or through the allocation of block grant funds within the states.

Conclusion

AASCU state colleges and universities are a major resource for the education of millions of Americans, about a fourth of all undergraduate students and large numbers of graduate students. They are also a major resource in research, international education, agricultural and economic development, and community service. In the uncertain times that lie ahead, with both demographic and fiscal problems facing most states, AASCU institutions need to make their case as clearly as possible with both federal and state officials.

Most federal programs affecting higher education serve America well. Many are underfunded. AASCU stands ready to work with officials to improve these programs and to try to reduce conflicts arising from unreasonable federal or state intrusion into academic matters.

However, there are still too many forms of regulation or restriction that are counterproductive in terms of the purpose of these programs. There is a need to provide incentives to ensure that the talents and energies of state colleges and universities of America will be utilized to the fullest, to fulfill their mandate to educate a wide range of fellow citizens and thus to further the national interest.

Federal Relations

WHEREAS, Aid to education is an investment in human resources which has been demonstrated to repay itself many times over in added American productivity as well as increased tax revenues; and

WHEREAS, Federal assistance to higher education in the form of aid to students; support for research and education in the sciences, arts, humanities, health fields, international relations, and many other fields; and assistance in the training of specialists and professionals has made it possible for hundreds of thousands of Americans to obtain a college education and for our nation to advance in many fields; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the American Association of State Colleges and Universities urges the President and the Congress of the United States not to reduce further federal funds for students and institutions of higher education.

Status of Department of Education

WHEREAS, Proposals to dismantle the Department of Education, turn most programs into block grants, and disperse remaining programs to non-educational agencies (such as transferring student aid to the Treasury Department) would substantially decrease the effectiveness of the delivery of federal aid to students and institutions; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That in order to preserve recognition of the high priority which education has in our nation, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities urges that the present Department of Education and its present statutory programs should be retained at the Cabinet level.

State Control of Federal Funds

WHEREAS, There are continued attempts to assert state control over federal aid to higher education, whether through state legislative reappropriation which authorizes state coordinating agencies to control federal funds, or block grant approaches with funds to be administered by state agencies; and

WHEREAS, All such efforts endanger the effective use of funds by students and institutions in the national interest; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the American Association of State Colleges and Universities continues to oppose efforts by the states to control federal funds to students and institutions of higher education, whether through state legislatures, coordinating boards, or other agencies of state government.

Commendation for Congressional Support

RESOLVED, That the American Association of State Colleges and Universities commends very strongly those members of both houses of Congress and both political parties who have continued to support adequate funding for higher education programs in the current session of Congress.

Opposition to Tax Cuts

WHEREAS, The American Association of State Colleges and Universities represents 349 [as of November 10, 1981] institutions of higher education enrolling 30 percent of all baccalaureate students in the country; and

WHEREAS, AASCU institutions have long been strongly committed to increasing international understanding through educational and cultural exchanges; and

WHEREAS, A positive image of the United States and a deeper understanding of its purposes are increasingly important in this time of international stress; and

WHEREAS, Other major countries of the world are currently making substantial efforts and expenditures for international education and cultural exchanges; and

WHEREAS, The Soviet Union now spends ten times as much on such international education and cultural exchanges as the United States, therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the American Association of State Colleges and Universities objects to the excessive and disproportionate cuts recommended by the Administration for the Education and Cultural Affairs programs of the International Communication Agency, including the Fulbright program and student support services and, therefore, strongly recommends the highest level of funding for these programs as recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Teacher Preparation

WHEREAS, Institutions of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities have historically played a leading role in the preparation of America's elementary and secondary teachers; and

WHEREAS, America's schools have successfully met the unprecedented enrollment demands of the post-World War II era; and

WHEREAS, Those enrollment demands have now abated, thereby providing an opportunity for America's schools to confront the continuing social and academic school problems by rededicating themselves to education of high quality; and

WHEREAS, Such rededication is dependent upon the quality of teacher preparation programs; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the membership of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities reaffirms its historic commitment to the preparation of well-qualified, competent teachers prior to resurgence of school enrollment demands in the mid-1980s; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the American Association of State Colleges and Universities directs its Committee on Policies and Purposes to take all steps necessary to alert AASCU members to this educational need, including the preparation of a position paper addressing this vital national issue.

Responsibilities and Rights of College Presidents

WHEREAS, The American Association of State Colleges and Universities ten years ago adopted a policy statement on the responsibilities and rights of college presidents; and

WHEREAS, Substantial changes in the ten-year period prompted the Committee on Policies and Purposes to prepare a new statement for consideration by governing boards, and chief executive officers of AASCU member institutions, therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the American Association of State Colleges and Universities adopt as a policy statement the following paper prepared by the Committee on Policies and Purposes entitled "Responsibilities and Rights of College Presidents," November 10, 1981.

RESPONSIBILITIES AND RIGHTS OF THE COLLEGE PRESIDENT

Historically, the role of the college or university president in the United States has been central to the successful development of institutions of quality and stability. The requirement for leadership has been, and will remain, critical.

Governing boards have the ultimate legal responsibility for the development, operation, and management of institutions under their authority. Faculties and other constituencies share in varying degrees responsibility for helping to develop major policy recommendations. However, as the only administrative agent of the governing board and as a representative of each constituency involved with the institution, the president has a crucial role in the development and maintenance of institutional quality and stability.

Based on these assumptions, this statement outlines the major responsibilities and concomitant rights of the president that are necessary if he or she is to be successful in ensuring the achievement of institutional purposes, goals, and objectives. The exact definition of each presidency varies widely and reflects the diversity of governance and mission in the United States. Indeed, it is difficult to use a standard terminology in discussing the role of the president because of the existence of different titles, institutional missions, governing relationships, influence of other external agencies, and internal conditions of employment. This statement focuses on the president as chief executive officer of a campus, although the general principles encompass the responsibilities and rights of systems' presidents and chancellors; of the chief executive officer of individual campuses, whether within a system or reporting directly to a board; and of presidents of institutions, whether unionized or nonunionized.

Fundamental to these general principles is the axiom that the president must have authority and rights which permit him or her to meet the responsibilities and expectations of the office.

Role of Universities and Colleges

The role of the university or college in the United States continues the historic functions of the discovery of new knowledge, the conservation and practical application of existing knowledge, and the communication of that knowledge to students and the general public. Therefore, the primary missions of colleges and universities are teaching, research, and service. Although the balance among these functions will vary from time to time within each institution and among institutions, the president must have the authority and the rights necessary to achieve the current institutional mission with quality and financial stability.

Governing Board

With few exceptions, the governing board is the final institutional authority. In the case of public institutions established by constitutional or statutory provisions, limitations may exist to the board's authority either under the constitution or applicable state law. Nevertheless, the governing board is responsible for protecting the integrity of the institution and for preserving academic freedom by shielding the institution from political intervention.

The board should delegate authority to the president commensurate with his or her responsibilities. In a centralized system, the board may delegate all or a portion of that responsibility to the chief executive officer of the system who, in turn, either delegates to the chief executive officers of individual campuses or acts as a facilitator to the chief executive officers of the campuses in their exercise of the authority delegated to them by the governing board.

The selection of the president is the governing board's most important decision. Once having made that decision, the governing board must ensure that the president is vested with appropriate authority to carry out the duties and responsibilities for which he or she is to be held accountable. The governing board (and if the institution is part of a multicollege system, its central staff) must operate in a manner that does not erode the authority of the president but rather supports his or her authority and the integrity of the institution.

Responsibilities

As chief executive officer, the president is responsible for recommending broad policies and personnel to the board and for implementing those policies approved by the board. In addition, the president must create and maintain a vision and sense of common purpose for the institution and its constituencies that develops and sustains institutional direction and self-esteem. The governing board should recognize that it, through the president, holds final responsibility for the health, safety, and welfare of the institution and its personnel, including students. The president's primary responsibility is that of administering the institution in the achievement of its mission, including education, research, and service in accordance with the laws of the state, the policies of the governing board, and the resources of the institution. Specific responsibilities include but are not limited to the following:

1. The administration of board policies regulating institutional mission, goals and objectives, instructional programs, research, public service, financial affairs, student affairs, and physical facilities.

2. The direction of current and long-range planning relating to his or her institutional responsibilities.

3. The development and maintenance of an appropriate administrative organization and governance structure to facilitate the most efficient and effective utilization of institutional resources in the achievement of the institution's mission and goals.

4. The development and maintenance of a personnel system concerned with the recruitment, selection, assignment, supervision, evaluation, promotion and retention, or tenure of all personnel employed by the institution.

5. The planning and development of the means for securing and maintaining the resources necessary for the achievement of the institution's mission at the highest

possible level of quality, including the presentation to appropriate funding agencies of the needs of the institution.

6. The preparation and presentation of the annual operating and capital budgets and the institutional allocation and supervision of all appropriated and other funds.

7. The development and maintenance of the facilities, materials, equipment, and services necessary for the support of institutional functions.

8. The communication of the policies and views of the board to the institutional community and other constituencies and, conversely, communication of the views of the university's constituencies on appropriate issues to the governing board.

9. The presentation of information to the governing board about the current and prospective condition of the institution, including its goals, accomplishments, and potential problems.

10. The representation of the university or college to relevant external constituencies.

11. The development and maintenance of academic programs to achieve the institution's missions and goals.

12. The termination of his or her association with the institution in a professional manner that does not unnecessarily discredit or damage public confidence in the governing board or the institution.

Rights of the President

Rights should not be confused with privileges. Rights encourage and support the president in the exercise of institutional leadership even though resulting in the opposition of one or more constituencies.

As chief executive officer of the institution, the president must have the authority and rights conducive to the effective exercise of his or her responsibility.

1. The president must have direct access to the governing board, or, in the case of a centralized system, to the appropriate authority charged with presenting institutional proposals, budgets, and problems to the governing board. The governing board or other appropriate centralized authority should not meet formally with any representatives of the institution's various constituencies without the president's presence or approval. The governing board should not meet without the president or his or her representative except in unusual circumstances, such as personal matters relating to the president's position.

2. The governing board or appropriate central authority should ask the president for his or her advice and recommendations on all matters before the board which may affect the institution. No changes affecting an institution in any regard should be made by the governing board (or a coordinating board, commission for higher education, central staff, or other state agencies) without appropriate advice and recommendations from the president of that institution. The governing board or other governing authority should clearly distinguish between official communications to or from the president and the comments of individual board members and officers.

3. The governing board should hold the president free of any personal liability in the execution of his or her duties and responsibilities so long as he or she is acting as the board's chief executive officer. This should include protection against physical and psychological harassment and against damage suits.

4. The governing board should evaluate the performance of the president in a manner that will enhance and strengthen his or her effectiveness as chief executive officer of the institution.

5. The governing board should ensure a reasonable degree of economic security for the president so that he or she is encouraged and supported in taking the risks inherent in leadership. It may do so by providing him or her with a contract for a specified term with tenure in an appropriate academic department or with a guaranteed period of notice or other appropriate means. The governing board should also provide appropriate transitional assistance.

6. In the event that a board decides to terminate the president, the termination should be handled in a professional manner that does not damage public confidence in the governing board or the institution or unnecessarily discredit the president or damage his or her reputation.

7. The president should be provided with sufficient administrative and staff support to discharge the responsibilities and expectations placed upon him or her by the governing board.

8. The president should have authority to recommend personal actions subject to contractual and legal limitations and to consultation with other constituencies appropriate to the position.

9. The governing board or the president may delegate responsibilities to other campus constituencies; however, the president must retain authority to initiate and approve actions necessary to the achievement of his or her responsibilities.

Science Education

WHEREAS, National security and economic strength of the United States depends upon a continuous flow of educated individuals into science and technology; and

WHEREAS, U.S. ability to produce educated manpower is decreasing and the country faces a critical shortage of scientists and engineers in the next decade; and

WHEREAS, It is in the national interest to reverse this decline that is threatening economic growth and national security; and

WHEREAS, The reversal of this decline will require increased support from government and industry; and

WHEREAS, The 349 [as of November 10, 1981] member institutions of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities play a major role in both research and development activities and in the education of our nation's scientific manpower; and

WHEREAS, The rapidly advancing state of knowledge in engineering and science requires continuous development of current faculty; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the American Association of State Colleges and Universities calls upon industry and state and federal governments to undertake prompt actions and provide additional assistance to the education of America's next generation of engineers and scientists through mechanisms such as improving direct support to colleges and universities, providing tax incentives to encourage private and industrial support and developing public awareness of the gravity of the current crisis situation.

Implementation of Tax Cuts

WHEREAS, The increase in appropriations for public postsecondary education institutions in some states has not offset inflation; and

WHEREAS, Some states have cut appropriations for public higher education institutions with little or no notice in the middle of the budget execution cycle; and

WHEREAS, Additional cuts are imminent in some states; and

WHEREAS, The diminishing level of appropriations for public higher education institutions ultimately will result in either a diminution of quality or access, or both; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the American Association of State Colleges and Universities promote an understanding of the impact of continuing cuts in appropriations on access to quality educational programs; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the American Association of State Colleges and Universities recommends to the states that maximum flexibility be provided to chief executive offic at the campus level to implement such cuts.

N ralism

REAS, The "new Federalism" of President Ronald Reagan is reducing Federal a the states; and

WHEREAS, This reduction in Federal aid diminishes the ability of the states to support public higher education institutions; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the American Association of State Colleges and Universities supports the National Governors' Association and the National Conference of State Legislatures in opposing further cuts in Federal aid to the states.

State Student Aid

WHEREAS, Many state actions have significantly increased tuition and fee charges at public institutions;

WHEREAS, Because of budgetary constraints some states now may be faced with the choice of maintaining access to postsecondary educational opportunities or choice between public and private postsecondary educational opportunities;

RESOLVED, That the American Association of State Colleges and Universities believes that the primary purpose of state student aid programs should be to promote access to postsecondary educational opportunities and not necessarily to provide a choice between public and private institutions.

RESOLVED, That the American Association of State Colleges and Universities believes also that the best means of providing access to postsecondary educational opportunities is to maintain low tuition levels at public postsecondary educational institutions.

Policy Statement on the Urban College or University

WHEREAS, Approximately one-half of the member institutions of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities are defined as urban institutions; and

WHEREAS, The urban members of AASCU occupy a unique position among institutions of higher education by virtue of their mission to serve the diverse needs of urban communities in which they are located; and

WHEREAS, The AASCU Standing Committee on Urban Affairs perceived the need to articulate the unique position of AASCU urban institutions in a statement defining the role and responsibilities of these institutions; and

WHEREAS, The Committee has drafted, circulated, and revised the statement on the urban state college or university to conform to the interests and beliefs of AASCU urban members; and

WHEREAS, The Committee has unanimously adopted said statement as a delineation of the unique role and responsibilities of AASCU urban members; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the American Association of State Colleges and Universities general membership adopt and officially endorse the following statement on the urban state college or university as an article of faith and identity for AASCU urban institutions.

POLICY STATEMENT ON THE URBAN STATE COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY

The spectacular growth of American urban colleges and universities in size and number since 1945 is a reflection of profound societal changes that have shifted the center of American life away from its rural roots to the now predominant metropolitan areas. This newest link in the pluralistic chain of American higher education has absorbed an increasing range of responsibilities that have arisen as a direct result of the social, economic, and political forces that have reshaped urban living.

The overriding instrument of urban change has been population growth. Since the end of World War II, the cities have been magnets for almost continuous waves of new residents—blacks, Hispanics, ethnic minorities, and rural whites—all in search of

opportunity. As these new populations arrived, the cities sprawled past their once well-defined "city limits" into suburban lands, over-running adjacent villages and townships.

Americans began to develop new notions of city life and to view the management of urban growth through different eyes. Old concepts and power centers were tumbled; solutions to new problems were often outpaced by a proliferation of yet more complex problems. Every city institution—government, neighborhoods, schools, churches, business, and industry—faced the need to adapt to change.

The Mission of the Urban University

The urban colleges and universities of the 1980s spring from different backgrounds. Some were directed by boards of trustees or legislative bodies to adapt to the realities of new constituencies and new needs for services. Others were especially created to serve burgeoning populations with an increasing appetite for education. Still others, already tuned to the rhythms of the cities, began to redefine their roles, seeking creative ways to teach more heterogeneous student bodies, designing new academic programs to meet particular needs of their communities, and establishing new directions for research and service that responded more directly to emerging urban problems.

Among urban colleges and universities are state-sponsored higher education institutions that serve metropolitan communities. The urban state colleges and universities are comprehensive in their approach to education and service. They offer a wide range of undergraduate, graduate, and professional studies; pursue a equally diverse research agenda; and lend their considerable knowledge resources in countless ways to their communities. Lacking the broad federal mandate of the historic land-grant colleges of the late nineteenth century to introduce education to farmers, mechanics, and others without access to higher learning, these urban state colleges and universities have carved out their own mission. Like the early land-grant colleges, which reached into almost every aspect of rural life, the modern urban state colleges and universities are redirecting higher education in the cities.

A Profile of Urban Students

Students represent the city's polyglot of races and cultures that are at once enriching and provincial. Like the farmers and mechanics of the early land-grant days, they are, for the most part, the people who previously were left out of a less accommodating, more narrowly structured system of education beyond high school.

Nevertheless, they want access to careers with promise, better jobs than they now have, more stimulating and rewarding lives, and the inner satisfaction and dignity that education can bring. The motivation is strong, even when the odds against success seem great and the sacrifices loom large.

They are inner-city and minority youths who are the first in their family to attend college. They are college-bound youngsters who would qualify for entrance at most universities. They are also youngsters whose academic preparation is too weak for success in higher education without special help in starting out.

They are adult men and women with full-time jobs and family responsibilities. Some are college drop-outs with a new drive to finish their education. Others are long out of high school—or college—who discover their aspirations and abilities demand more education.

Urban state colleges and university students are old[illegible]d average age of 28 years is not unusual. More and more, the part-time student is in the majority. Balancing work, family and community obligations, and study is a way of life for most. Earning a bachelors or a graduate degree may require longer than traditionally expected of the full-time, resident student.

Programs at Urban Universities

Academic programs include the range of traditional liberal arts and professional studies, undergraduate and graduate, but they also recognize the practical world of urban affairs and the requirements of a diverse student population. Professors still teach in classrooms, but some of the classrooms may be located in a plant, a bank building, a senior citizens' center, and city hall. Researchers still search for solutions to problems in laboratories, but some of the laboratories may be out on the streets and the problems may include transit, sanitation, small business development, and community relations.

Urban state colleges and universities are also becoming more adept at assisting students to overcome barriers to college education that were once thought to be insurmountable. Through experiment and experience, dedicated faculty members and administrators have created diagnostic processes to identify academic deficiencies and have developed learning techniques to help students to correct weaknesses. They tap the potential of the poorly prepared and challenge them to succeed, all while sustaining academic curricula and instruction that meet the standards of quality and excellence prevailing throughout higher education.

Through an ever-widening variety of programs, the urban state college or university forges links with its community, creating networks and coalitions that strengthen and support a valuable partnership. The city is both an education resource for students and the beneficiary of the professional knowledge and talent of faculty.

Professors and students may work together staffing a speech and hearing clinic for children, recodifying city ordinances, and studying the future capacity of water and sewage systems. The campus may house a gerontology institute where faculty administer government-funded programs and students receive career training. Community service programs can be as diverse as training city government personnel in the technology of new management information systems and exploring the feasibility or urban aquaculture—raising fish for food in tanks alongside the home vegetable plot. It may be engaged in neighborhood restoration and the preservation and conversion of historic landmarks for public use. It has the human resources at hand to respond to unusual needs, such as preparing women and minorities for greater management involvement in trade unions, traditionally dominated by white males. Its faculty is a ready source of expert knowledge for legislatures and government departments, local business, and neighborhood organizations.

The Contribution of Urban Universities

Urban state colleges and universities are an enriching supplement to the city's cultural life through drama, dance, music, film, and art that can venture into experimental realms unavailable in commercial entertainment.

Often overlooked is the contribution to the city's economy. Faculty, staff, and students are a vital part of the economic action, spending and saving, borrowing and lending, and paying taxes. The institutions are purchasers of goods and services and managers of cash flow. They draw funds from outside the community through grants, gifts, campus visitors, and other sources that funnel back into the local economy.

Through all of the many lines—formal and informal—that run from the campus out into the community and back, information is exchanged, new relationships established, and common fronts formed that constantly refresh the city-university connection.

Special Needs of Urban Universities

The road that has led to new modes of teaching and learning, new goals for research, and a more intimate partnership with the community has not been traveled without pain and frustration.

Changes in urban higher education triggered by outside forces have rendered old formulas for operational funding and capital spending obsolete and inadequate. The rules for financing education Monday through Friday from 9 to 5 on a self-contained campus cannot be applied successfully to an increasing population of students who attend part-time, in a variety of locations, and on an extended time schedule.

Open admissions with the necessary intensive academic care for students whose basic academic skills are not sufficient for success in college work are an expensive, necessary investment. The high cost of the earlier college years needed to ensure later academic success for such students is a tempting target for outside budget and policy makers.

On campus there is forceful competition between those who hold firm to the traditions of their own academic training and those who have been attracted to a more open philosophy dedicated to taking students as they are and adjusting the system in order to bring them along.

Like the cities they serve, the urban state colleges and universities struggle to break out of outdated operational processes that no longer seem valid to create understanding and acceptance for new educational roles and to win support for programs with an admitted risk.

Conclusion

For the city and a large majority of its residents, higher education remains the one best hope for survival and advancement. Faced with the multitude of familiar and common problems—inadequate housing, racial conflict, aging infrastructure, high energy costs, mass transit, crime, pollution, and more—the city's single most valuable asset will be an educated citizenry that cuts across all lines and that perceives an equal stake in the community. Those who are properly equipped by education and trained for work will have the humaneness, civic awareness, self respect, productivity, and knowledge essential to the future stability of urban America.

Commendation and Appreciation

RESOLVED, That the American Association of State Colleges and Universities acknowledges and expresses appreciation to the following Presidents and Chancellors

of Member Institutions in Colorado who, as hosts, set a tone of hospitality in their membership reception and provided staff support for the AASCU office and registration desk during the Association's 21st Annual Meeting: President William Fulkerson, Adams State College; President Rexer Berndt, Fort Lewis College; President John U. Tomlinson, Mesa College; President Curtis E. Wright, Metropolitan State College; Chancellor Gene M. Nordby, University of Colorado at Denver; President Robert Dickeson, University of Northern Colorado; President Lyle C. Wilcox, University of Southern Colorado; President John P. Mellon, Western State College of Colorado; and President John A. Marvel, Consortium of State Colleges in Colorado; and be it further

RESOLVED, That special gratitude be expressed to Chancellor Donald Schwartz of the University of Colorado, Colorado Springs, who, as primary host, advised the Association in planning special events and logistical details for the meeting.

Access to Higher Education

RESOLVED, That the American Association of State Colleges and Universities reaffirms the concept that opportunities for admission to institutions of higher learning be enhanced for all desiring persons by the development of admissions criteria which recognize the diverse backgrounds of the total population and that access to study at AASCU institutions not be denied for reasons of sex, race, age, national origin, religion, or physical handicap.

Affirmative Action

RESOLVED, That the American Association of State Colleges and Universities recommits itself to the principle of affirmative action and equal employment opportunity and urges its member institutions to continue their actions to implement those principles.

Funding for Higher Education

WHEREAS, The role of higher education is so crucial and vital to the continued strength of this nation; and

WHEREAS, The dire condition of the economy is recognized; and

WHEREAS, Reduced financial support for higher education has been affected in recent actions at the federal level; and

WHEREAS, The proposal has been made to shift much of the responsibility for the support of higher education to the individual states; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the American Association of State Colleges and Universities urges that high priority be given to adequate funding for educational programs at both the federal and state levels.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS

The chairman of the nominating committee, President Fred W. DeMoney, Montana College of Mineral Science and Technology, presented the following slate of candidates which was unanimously approved by the membership:

Chairman-Elect: James W. Cleary, president, California State University, Northridge; Secretary/Treasurer: Rodney A. Briggs, president, Eastern Oregon State College: Directors: Virgus R. Cardozier, president, University of Texas of the Permian Basin (three-year term); Myron L. Coulter, president, Idaho State University (three-year term); H. Douglas Covington, chancellor, Winston-Salem State University, NC (three-year term); Larraine R. Matusak, president, Thomas Edison State College, NJ (three-year term); Warren J. Baker, president, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo (one-year term); and Charles G. Mayo, president, West Chester State College, PA (one-year term).

The following members also served on the 1981 nominating committee: Benjamin Alexander, president, Chicago State University, IL; Alice Chandler, president, State University College at New Paltz, NY; William Maxwell, president, Jersey City State College, NJ; Edward M. Penson, chancellor, University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh; John A. Peoples, Jr., president, Jackson State University, MS; and James M. Rosser, president, California State University, Los Angeles.

TRIBUTE TO DR. MERZE TATE

John Bernhard
President
Western Michigan University

In these days of gloomy forecasting and sour cynicism, it is heartwarming to tell the remarkable story of a truly remarkable woman—a woman who fulfilled her personal dreams despite the awesome burden of racism, sexism, and other adversities. This is the story of Dr. Merze Tate, outstanding scholar, teacher, and author.

Dr. Tate's deep commitment to education and to the world of scholarship and learning developed early. A descendant of a pioneer, homesteading family in Blanchard, Michigan, she chose Western Michigan University as the place to gain advanced knowledge, and I am very proud of that fact. Upon her graduation, Dwight Waldo, the first president of Western, helped her find a teaching job in neighboring Indiana when no such work could be found in Michigan, and she was on her way! No one knew then just how far she would go, but with her commitment, motivation, and character, it was going to be a long distance! Parenthetically, I should add that Dr. Tate came from a poor but proud family, with high ideals. Therefore, though she had to borrow money for her education, she paid back every loan before she even bought a new dress for herself after graduation.

She enrolled in Columbia University, earning a master's degree in 1930; but that was only the beginning of many truly spectacular beginnings. For she then became the first American Black woman ever to enroll in Oxford University, and in 1935 the first Black person to earn an advanced degree at that prestigious institution. But she climbed still higher, this time gaining a Ph.D. degree, awarded jointly by Radcliffe College and Harvard University, in 1941.

Then came another beginning—the beginning of a distinguished career as teacher, scholar, and author at Bennett College, Morgan State University, and finally at Howard University, from which Dr. Tate retired as emerita professor of history in 1977, after 35 years of dedicated service. The recipient of many research grants, she is the author of seven books. Among them are The Disarmament Illusion—The Movement for a Limitation of Armaments, published by Macmillan, and The United States and Armaments, published by Harvard University Press.

Issued in 1942 and 1948, respectively, those books are as timely today as when they were first written, and they are still important reference works for the U.S. Department of State and UNESCO. These books were published under the auspices of the Bureau of International Research at Radcliffe and Harvard—as was a third book, The United States and the Hawaiian Kingdom, released by Yale University Press in 1968, and reissued this year by Greenwood Press of New York.

Dr. Tate's exceptional achievements certainly have not gone unrecognized before this night. In 1948 she received the Outstanding Achievement Award of the National Urban League, and she also served as a Fulbright Lecturer in India during 1950-51. These are only token examples of the many other honors he has obtained. But tonight our AASCU award to Dr. Tate is intended to be a national capstone tribute to the remarkable career of a most remarkable woman.

A few moments ago I talked about beginnings—and I know that Dr. Tate has never ceased making more of them. Currently, she has four manuscripts in press and is participating in an oral-history project at Radcliffe College—in which she is both a research interviewer and one of the project's six subjects. I wonder now what else she might have begun in her active and restless mind since last we talked—earlier this evening!

Few people are generous with both their time and their money. Dr. Tate is one of this rare breed. Not only has she dedicated her life to learning, but she has dedicated much of her financial resources to it, as well—with generous endowments at various institutions, including Western Michigan University.

Most recently, she has given $150,000 to her alma mater to establish the Merze Tate Center for Research Information Processing in our College of Education. The new center will be truly a blessing to advanced graduate students and to faculty members. Thanks to her, theses, dissertations, and research papers will be processed with the most modern equipment available. This generous gift represents her own special vision and unique insight into the needs of future generations of students.

Dr. Tate, permit me to join with all my AASCU colleagues in declaring that your career as an exceptional international scholar and teacher commands sincere recognition in and of itself. We are very proud indeed to have you represent the excellence found in our state colleges and universities.

Because of your brilliant achievements and exemplary commitment to higher education, we are greatly in your debt. And we wish to acknowledge that debt tonight with the highest honor that our organization can bestow—the Distinguished Alumnus Award of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities. Sincere congratulations and best wishes!

PRESENTATION

Roland Dille
President
Moorhead State University, Minnesota
and Chairman of AASCU

There is, I think, nothing that gives this organization greater joy than its annual award to a distinguished graduate of one of its member institutions. The Board of Directors each year chooses a graduate who exemplifies the character of our purposes, one who is not only qualified but willing to apply ability and learning to the benefit of American society and the world.

I suppose that no recipient of the Distinguished Alumnus Award—tonight we will call it Alumna Award—gives us so much pride and pleasure as one who has found within our gates a passion for learning. If we who have little time for scholarship or, perhaps, little aptitude, feel any envy, it is surely lost in our profound satisfaction that our students have discovered, and still discover, the heart of our enterprise.

As you have heard, tonight's recipient has met not only our highest expectations but our brightest visions. That Merze Tate came to college from circumstances that did not allow her easily to assume that the opportunity for higher education would be hers, is not relevant to her high achievements, but it is relevant to our sense of ourselves and our heritage.

In honoring you, Dr. Tate, we are honoring an extraordinary person, but we are also remembering all the students who have sat in our classrooms, in some of whom curiosity may have merely flickered, in others of whom the desire to know has been a constant flame. And we remind ourselves, in all humility, that our institutions have believed in the life of the mind.

In you, Dr. Tate, on this night, we find reason for a reaffirmation of our calling.

Dr. Merze Tate, I am proud to present to you the 1981 Distinguished Alumna Award of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

ACCEPTANCE REMARKS

Merze Tate
Educator and Author
AASCU 1981 Distinguished Alumnus Recipient

On this occasion, when the American Association of State Colleges and Universities honors an alumnus who is primarily a product of state supported schools and a state university, she is bound to reflect on the significance of the location of her birth. Closely associated with the 19th century westward movement and settlement of the Northwest Territory and state supported education was pressure for the distribution of free land, which eventually resulted in the Homestead Act of 1862, providing for the transfer of parcels of unoccupied land to each homesteader on payment of a nominal fee. This became a magnet that attracted ambitious whites and energetic free Blacks, as well as northern European immigrants.

Free soil and practically free land prompted both my maternal and paternal great grandparents to migrate westward into Ohio. The offsprings of both families, preferring a less densely settled region and a wider choice of virgin land, traveled by covered wagon into the state of Michigan, not into the southwestern border, where several colored families had already settled, but into the heart of the wilderness where, along with white settlers, they felled the trees, built the first log houses, log barns, log schools, log churches, corduroy roads, and pine-root and log fences. There my mother, Myrtle Katora Lett, and my father, Charles Tate, settled and their daughter Merze was born, the granddaughter and daughter of forever free homesteaders. This had been Chippewa Indian territory, preempted by Germans, Irish, Scotch-Irish, Scots, some Englishmen and Scandinavians.

By the time the Tate child was five years old the pioneer log schools in Isabella County had been replaced by frame one-room structures, not painted red, but a creamy white, with a belfry, and spaced approximately four miles apart on surveyed dirt and gravel roads, which meant that free public education was available to most children within two miles of their home. Her school, Rolland Township, No. 5, was once an acre of her mother's farm. The curriculum was not limited to the three Rs, but included geography, history, horticulture, orthography, and physiology. Her geography books were illustrated with fascinating pictures of the Acropolis, the Pyramids, the Cape of Good Hope, Victoria Falls, Hong Kong, Madalay, Siam, Singapore, Zanzibar, New Zealand, Australia, Fiji Islands, Niagara Falls, the Grand Canyon, the huge redwood tree in California through which a carriage could pass, and the Christ of the Andes. How she dreamed of seeing some of these far away places with strange sounding names. Those dreams have largely been fulfilled. In her sophomore year at Blanchard High, to which she walked four miles each way, the building was burned. Classes were held in churches, but the absence of laboratories for science prevented students from qualifying

for college entrance. Therefore they were graduated from the tenth grade. Your guest, the youngest in the class and the only colored, was named valedictorian. To qualify for college entrance, she enrolled in Battle Creek High School, where she maintained an A average. Unable to qualify for valedictorian, she did, however, win the Hynman Oratorical contest, with a $50 prize, sponsored by the high school.

Applying at the then Western Michigan Teachers College in Kalamazoo, she received a tuition scholarship and worked for board and room at $5 per week in the home of the president of a Kalamazoo paper company. After receiving a diploma, teaching a year in a Cass County grade school and carrying Western Michigan's correspondence courses in history and economics, she returned to college with adequate savings for board and room, and managed to complete the four year requirements for the B.A. in three years. This degree qualified her to teach history and the social sciences at the senior high school level. Since Michigan in the 1920s did not employ colored teachers in senior high schools, Western's Placement Bureau was unable to place a prospective graduate with the College's highest academic record, 45 A's and 6 B's. Consequently, the Dean of Women, the Registrar, and the President decided to loan their honor student money to seek employment out of state. Interviews in Indianapolis, Cincinnati, and St. Louis, resulted in the offer of a contract in each city. In Indianapolis the superintendent of schools, impressed by the fact that the applicant's practicing teaching had been at the senior high school level in Western Michigan added $100 for a year's teaching experience to the basic beginning salary. This increment, together with the fact that Indianapolis was closest to home, prompted acceptance of the position at the then new Crispus Attucks High School.

During the five years that your guest taught in Indianapolis she profitted from Indiana University's Extension program by pursuing advanced courses in French and German and graduate work in European History. She also attended the intersession and summer sessions of Teachers College, Columbia University, from which she received the M.A. degree in 1930. The courses there were largely extensions and in-depth treatment of subjects at Western Michigan. On an objective test in a United States Constitutional History Class of 115 members, nine-tenths of whom were men, and many of these college or university instructors, an unpretentious high school teacher from Indianapolis made the highest grade, 98 percent, and was the only one who answered correctly the number of methods for amending the constitution of the United States, which, of course, is four. In announcing the results the professor asked Mr. Tate to raise his hand. But, Miss Tate had learned the correct number in a political science class at Western Michigan, the number had not been mentioned in Columbia University lectures.

At the Geneva School of International Studies and later at Oxford University, the erudite lectures in international law were based on cases the historic background of which had been taught in courses at Western Michigan College. A Harvard graduate lecture course in international trade was approached through arithmetic and algebraic formulas in a complicated and involved procedure from which the instructor frequently could not extricate himself. In his treatment of trade among agrarian, developing, and industrial countries your guest discerned basic facts which she had learned in an undergraduate course in world trade at Western.

After having taught 7 years in state supported public schools and a state university, and 35 years in a federally assisted university, your guest has given or has designated her savings and investments to the two educational institutions that have influenced her career and have contributed most to the meager success she has achieved in a color and sex discriminating society and to another that provided the major amount of her income. The largest share has been or will be allocated to Western Michigan University for having provided the foundation for her higher education and for assistance through scholarships and loans in launching her on her career. Two trusts have endowed a Merze Tate Scholarship and provided for the establishment of the Merze Tate Center for Research Information Processing in the College of Education. Radcliffe College is and will be the recipient of the second largest share in appreciation of subventions from the Bureau of International Research of Harvard University and Radcliffe College leading to the publication of her first three major books, which in turn paved the way for several other publications, as well as for two achievement awards. A substantial contribution has endowed a Merze Tate Graduate Fellowship in the Mary Ingraham Bunting Graduate Institute.

Since we operate in a society and an economy in which most decisions are arrived at by men, sex discrimination in salary allocations is customary, inherent, and endemic. In spite of this at-times unconscious and at other times deliberate, nefarious, and malevolent treatment, Howard University, has provided much of the income that has made possible the benevolences. My contributions there have gone and will continue to be directed to the Lorraine A. Williams (Academic Vice President) Scholarship and to the endowment of the Merze Tate Seminar in Diplomatic History.

In providing for the above mentioned scholarship, fellowships, research facilities and seminar, your guest is attempting to discharge her obligation to state supported education, federally assisted professional education, and a private college that has been liberal in bestowing its awards and blessings on a member of a minority in American society.